LIBRARY
OF THE
Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.
BT 301 .P645 1867
Plumptre, E. H. 1821-1891.
Christ and Christendom

THE BOYLE LECTURES

For the Year 1866

CHRIST AND CHRISTENDOM

THE BOYLE LECTURES

For the Year 1866

DELIVERED AT THE CHAPEL ROYAL, WHITEHALL

BY E. H. PLUMPTRE, M.A.

Prebendary of St. Paul's; Professor of Divinity, and Chaplain, King's College, London

ALEXANDER STRAHAN, PUBLISHER
56, LUDGATE HILL, LONDON
1867

LONDON:
J. AND W. RIDER, PRINTERS,
BARTHOLOMEW CLOSE.

CONTENTS.

I.

CRAVINGS AFTFR UNION, AND LIVES OF JESUS.

PAGE

Recent Movements in different directions towards Unity—Attacks of Criticism on the Gospel Life of Christ—Relation of the Two Facts —The Special Work of Apologists in our Time 1

II.

SOURCES FOR THE LIFE OF CHRIST.

Tradition—Apocryphal Gospels,—The Four Gospels of the New Testament Canon—Their Authorship and Characteristics 29

III.

THE TRAINING OF THE KING.

Our Lord's Childhood and Growth—The Union of the Divine and Human Natures—The Work of the Baptist—The Baptism and Temptation . 83

IV.

THE NAMES OF CHRIST.

Messianic Expectations—History of the Name Messiah—The Son of God —The Son of Man—Rabbi 131

ERRATUM.

Page 369, in Note at foot of page, *for* οπρσποιητικῆς *read* προσποιητικῆς.

I.

CRAVINGS AFTER UNION, AND LIVES OF JESUS.

I.

CRAVINGS AFTER UNION, AND LIVES OF JESUS.

TWO signs of the times must, I imagine, force themselves upon the notice of all who watch the heavens, as more conspicuous than any others in the firmament of religious thought. Men may differ as to their meaning and the auguries they draw from them. As the selfsame redness of the sky, in the words which have made this form of speech proverbial, was a sign, either of coming clouds and storm, or of a day serene and bright, according as men saw it at the dawn or in the evening;[1] so now the selfsame facts will seem to some the presage of conflict, doubt, apostasy, to others of a clearer and purer faith, of an age which shall inherit the wisdom, but not the evils,

[1] Matt. xvi. 2, 3.

of its forerunners. On the one hand, among ourselves at least, and not without outstretched hands and echoes from answering voices elsewhere, we hear more clearly than before cries for the union of Christendom. Men put forth their *Eirenica*, as though the great schism of the Western Church might even now, after three centuries, be healed.[1] They cannot bear to think of a Christian society so mighty in its extent, so noble in much that it has accomplished, so rich in its inheritance from antiquity, as utterly apostate and cut off, however bitterly they may deplore its manifold corruptions. Others there are who turn with interest and sympathy to the long-slighted churches of the East, and dream that even there the half-desponding question, "Can these dry bones live?" might be answered, if with trembling, yet with hope also, "O Lord God, Thou knowest." Others yet again, leaving these schemes as impracticable or evil, look to religious societies which, if they are less venerable and stately, have at all events more points of contact with what has been for three centuries the national religious mind of England. They turn to foreign Reformed Churches (we need not shrink from following Hooker in so speaking of them[2]), as willing

[1] See Note A, on Attempts at a Restoration of Unity since the Reformation.

[2] Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.*, iv. 14, § 1; v. 28, § 1.

to fraternize with them on the common ground of antagonism to Romanism and unbelief. They turn to our Dissenting brethren (we need not shrink from following Sancroft in so speaking of them[1]), in the hope that the irritations of the past may be forgotten, that the sins, confusions, blindness of their fathers and ours may be left behind in the sense of a substantial unity and a common faith.

This is one of the signs of which I spoke. The most callous or cold-hearted can hardly fail to watch it with interest. The most sanguine, outside the circles within which the influence of the desire is felt, can hardly be very hopeful as to the result, unless some new condition intervene and some new force be brought into operation. These movements towards union in opposite directions are symptoms of wide-spread divisions. Even where the attraction is stronger, and the points of difference fewer, the whole history of Christendom shows us how easily the smallest matters of dogma, discipline, ritual, are magnified into impassable barriers. Mutual concessions, if made, involve, or are supposed to involve, the sacrifice on each side of vitality and strength.

[1] D'Oyly's *Life of Sancroft*, p. 196. The language is all the more striking as coming from a prelate who was afterwards at the head of the Non-jurors. The same document contains a fervent prayer for "the union of all reformed Churches, both at home and abroad, against our common enemies."

Negotiations, if opened, are likely to be broken off abruptly by irrepressible questions which men in vain attempt to avoid or to postpone. Conferences and schemes of compromise, in such cases, may do some good by making men known to each other, and removing prejudices, but we can hardly venture to expect more. The schisms of Christendom are not likely to be healed by any number of ecclesiastical diplomatists met in council and formulating an ultimatum.

The other sign of the times is even more conspicuous, and, to many, must seem far less hopeful. Step by step a criticism which seems relentless and destructive advances from the outer defences to the citadel. Questions as to the nature and degree of inspiration, the absolute infallibility of the inspired Word, in everything, or in all important facts, or in all matters of faith, seem to be left far behind. Questions as to the authorship or compilation of this or that book in the Old Testament, and whether, if compiled, it gives us history or legend,—these, though they may still excite interest or alarm, are not all that we have to deal with. The controversy with unbelief is brought to the issue whether Christendom has a Christ. Lives of Jesus follow one on the other, and they are written, as it seems to us, often with a distinctly hostile animus. The records of that life are dissected and

disputed. He whom we have worshipped as our Redeemer, Intercessor, Judge, Prophet, Priest, King, is brought before millions with great show of learning, or fascinating clearness, as being altogether such a one as ourselves, weak in will, oscillating in purpose, not without the taint of selfishness and fraud. To those who do not shrink from adopting these conclusions, or playing with the premises which lead to them, the age in which we live must seem that of the dissolution of one more of the great religions of the world. We are entering, as it were, into the dark chamber of death, where the past forms of faith "lie in glory," the lingering glory of a departed greatness, "every one in his own house." And as they who have been the "chief ones of the earth" behold the descent of yet another mightier and loftier than they, they take up their proverb of reproach—"'Art thou also become weak as we?' 'Art thou become like unto us?' 'Is this the *faith* that made the earth to tremble, and did shake kingdoms?'"[1]

What conclusions men may come to in the process of inquiry thus forced upon them must depend on many conditions of knowledge, temperament, character. The degree of alarm they may feel before entering on it, at the mere prospect of its approach,

[1] Isa. xiv. 9—18.

will be in exact proportion to the strength or weakness of their faith. Those who think that the house they have dwelt in is among the things that are decaying and waxing old, and ready to vanish away, will tremble at every blast of the storm-wind. Those who believe that they have a city that hath foundations, not made with hands, eternal in the heavens, will not fear though the floods of the sea rage horribly. They will yet go about Zion and count her towers and bulwarks. Christendom, in all its greatness and littleness, its strength and weakness, will seem to them as a city against which the gates of Hades, the power of death, shall not prevail. If some outworks, which men have added, have to be abandoned, there still remains the city whose builder and maker is God; and the foundation of that city, the groundwork of Christendom, the starting-point of Christianity, is found in the life of Christ.

In the midst, then, of our confusions and alarms, that sign of the times, though not without its awfulness, may yet suggest hope as well as fear. His life witnessed, His words heard, by multitudes of half-taught men, reported by few but little above their fellows in gifts of earthly knowledge, impressed itself, through them, upon the world's history. Through their witness the life which was shorter than most men's in its

span, the activity which might have seemed prematurely cut off, the energy confined within the limits of an obscure province, have exercised a marvellous and still increasing power. If the records of that life or teaching did not, from the first, constitute the Gospel which the disciples of Christ preached, they soon came, as by a true instinct, to be identified with it. It was through the impression made by those words and acts that men were led to rise from the reverence they felt for a Rabbi, a prophet, a martyr, to the adoration due to one whom they owned as the Son of the living God. The history of Christendom shows that, in proportion as men have lived in and on those words and acts, they have risen upward to truth and purity; that in proportion as they have neglected them they have fallen into grossest superstition or barren dogmatism. It cannot be altogether evil that the circumstances of our time should drive us back upon them, even against our will. Something, at least, there may be counterbalancing the danger. What that life, as seen through the records that are left us, did once, it may do yet again, not the less but the more completely because they are studied more thoroughly and exhaustively, and facts are seen as they were, and not through the dim haze of partial knowledge. When it was first manifested, it did not escape censure,

suspicion, condemnation. "He hath a demon, and is mad;" "He casteth out demons by Beelzebub;" "He deceiveth the people." It was "set for a sign to be spoken against."[1] But through all this it won its way in its own Divine completeness. Shall we despair of its winning its way again?

May it not even be, we may ask, that the discipline thus forced upon us is precisely what we need in order that our cravings and efforts after unity may not be purposeless and fruitless? Does the fiery redness of the sky speak only of the coming storm? May it not be the presage of a serener and brighter day? Because we have wandered away from the Divine method of education, which made that human life the starting-point of faith, we have lost our way in labyrinths, and strayed upon the dark mountains. May not all that is now leading us back to it be welcomed (how much soever we find to pity or condemn), as preparing us for a truer unity than any which rests on elaborated compromises or alliances? Is the hope to which one among us has given utterance altogether vain, that there "a world weary of the heat and dust of controversy—of speculations about God and man,—weary, too, of the rapidity of its own motion, may yet return

[1] John x. 20, vii. 12; Matt. xii. 24; Luke ii. 34.

home and find rest"?[1] May we not trace in the present, as in the past, a fulfilment of the wondrous words which He of whose life we speak Himself uttered?—"I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me."[2] As on the scribes of Jerusalem and the peasants of Galilee; as on the slaves and senators of the Roman Empire; as on the Goths whom Ulfilas taught and the Franks whom Clovis led; as in the devotion of the Crusades in the eleventh and the brotherhood of the Mendicant Orders in the thirteenth centuries, so now, in the prominence given to the life of Jesus, we may see a token of the working of that marvellous attractive power, as of a spell fascinating and irresistible. Many hearts it draws, and wins, as with "the cords of a man" and the bands of an everlasting mercy; and even where we miss this, even among those who stand without, not in the circle of the disciples, we may from time to time hear voices which at least remind us of Pilate's confession, "I find no fault in this man;"[3] or the witness of the centurion, "Certainly this was a righteous man;"[4] or that of the officers of the temple, "Never man spake like this man."[5]

For some, at least, the taunt of Strauss,[6] which

[1] Jowett, *Essays and Reviews*, p. 376. [2] John xii. 32. [3] Luke xxiii. 4. Luke xxiii. 47. [5] John vii. 46. [6] *Leben Jesu*, p. 5.

seems to come as from the very lips of Mephistopheles, that "the study of the life of Jesus is the snare in which the theology of our time is destined to be taken and destroyed," has not been a fulfilled prophecy. Men have risen above themselves to a higher level of faith and feeling when they came in contact with it. In varying degrees, those who have been least bound by the authority of the Church and the traditions of the schools, have bowed their heads in homage. With many drawbacks and defects common to all, with some peculiar to each, the histories which bear the names of many foreign scholars and divines, Neander, Schleiermacher, Ewald, Lange, Pressensé, and others, that of one among ourselves, written within the last few months, which is all the more striking because it bears no name,[1] are witnesses that those who thus admire and reverence are not far from the kingdom of God, and are on the way upward from negations to the acceptance of the living truth. Even in the *Vie de Jésus*, which most startles and offends us, there is at times a glow of sympathy and enthusiastic admiration, which may serve to kindle a like glow in those who have never thought of the character of Christ at all, and which the revolting suggestions

[1] I refer, of course, to *Ecce Homo*. See Note B, on Recent Lives of Jesus.

that are so strangely blended with it will not be able to deaden. Men will see how self-contradictory it is for the same writer to repeat the two discordant judgments which once marked contending parties, to utter in the same breath, "He is a good man," and "He deceiveth the people."[1]

If we are tempted to judge harshly of him and others who stand before another judgment-seat than ours, Divine words may float back upon our remembrance, checking the condemnation. There may be in those who thus speak (we know not and cannot know where) the evil heart of unbelief, the sin against the Holy Spirit, antipathy to goodness as such in proportion as it manifests itself in its completeness; but of all that falls short of this the words were spoken, "Whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him."[2] For all that falls short of this the prayer was offered, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do."[3]

The choice of a subject to which I have thus been led falls in, almost more completely than any other at the present time could do, with the conditions prescribed by the founder of this Lecture. He, too, was impressed with the feeling that the points on which Christians differ one from another are of small

[1] John vii. 12. [2] Matt. xii. 32. [3] Luke xxiii. 34.

moment as compared with the faith in which they all agree, and directed all who might be appointed as Lecturers to pass over those, and to confine themselves to the defence of these. He lived at a time when practically that defence was more difficult than it is now, because the warfare was carried on not with the weapons of historical and critical inquiry, which scholars and thinkers can wield as on equal ground, according to their skill, but with ridicule and *persiflage*, which often (as Butler complained a little later [1]) drove back the apologist within the barriers of a protesting silence, and when the attack was accordingly far more outrageous—more utterly wanting in all reverence for the character of Christ, and all appreciation of the history of Christendom. And that founder, we must remember, was himself not ignorant of the evil against which he called on those who followed him to wage war. It was by his own experience of the evil that he had learned to sympathize with and help those who were suffering from it. In a striking passage, which one among the most illustrious of my predecessors [2] has made familiar to many readers, he records how at one period of his life there fell upon him a horror of great darkness,

[1] Charge to Clergy of Durham.—Advertisement to the *Analogy*.

[2] Maurice, *Religions of the World*, Lect. I. The original is found in Boyle's *Works*, vol. i., p. 12.

"strange and hideous thoughts," "a deep, raving melancholy," "distracting doubts of some of the fundamentals of Christianity," "impious suggestions," "tedious perplexity." Out of this wretchedness he was delivered. In the very act which the Church of Christ has received as the pledge, witness, means of communion with His human life, and through it with the Divine nature which is inseparable from it, there came back upon him the "withdrawn sense of God's favour." We need not wonder that such an experience should have influenced for good of the highest kind the whole tenor of his after life. The school of merely forensic apologists, holding a brief for Christianity, who have never known that conflict with doubt, may be acute, triumphant, defiant, meeting scorn with scorn and railing with railing; but those who, like Boyle and Butler, have felt the misery of losing,[1] and the joy of regaining, their faith in Christ

[1] This may seem startling as regards the latter of the two names, but the following passages could hardly have been written by one who had not known the trials and temptations of which he speaks so strongly:—"The evidence of religion not appearing obvious, may constitute one particular part of some men's trial in a religious sense. . . . And thus, though the evidence of religion which is afforded to some men should be little more than that they are given to see the system of Christianity, or religion in general, to be supposable or credible, . . . even this will afford matter of exercise for religious suspense and deliberation. . . . It gives occasion and motives . . . to preserve attentively upon their minds a general implicit sense that they may be under Divine moral government, an awful solicitude about religion, whether natural or revealed. Such apprehension ought to turn men's eyes to every degree of

and God—those who have followed their Master in "being led up by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil,"—will, like Him, have learned to "have compassion on the ignorant and them that are out of the way," for that "they themselves also are compassed with infirmity." Any other temper than that of sympathy and pity, evil as it is everywhere, would in one who occupies this place be simply monstrous. It was not Boyle's wish to gratify Churchmen with the spectacle of a controversial triumph over absent foes, but to meet the disease of doubt which might be present with others under all outward conformity, as it had been present with himself,—to enable those who were free from that disease to deal as tenderly and gently with those who suffered from it as he would have wished to be dealt with himself,—to lead us to see in the doubts themselves, not an argument for crushing all the questions that rise unbidden within, and denouncing the progress of all inquiry from without, but a call to face the questions, to make the inquiry more thorough and more searching. As Augustine ad-

new light which may be had, from whatever side it comes." So, too, he adds, that for many to whom the common temptations of the world are no temptations at all, "persons without this shallowness of temper, persons of a deeper sense as to what is invisible and future," these difficulties and doubts may be the principal part at once of their probation and their training.—*Anal.*, ii. 6.

dressed the Manichæans of his day, after he had been led out of their dreams and delusions to the light of truth, so may we address those whom we believe to be living in dreams and delusions now. "Let them rage against you," so he spake, "who know not with what labour men arrive at truth, and with what difficulty they avoid errors. . . . Let those rage against you who know not through what sighings and groanings it is brought to pass that man can in ever so small a degree apprehend God. . . . Let those, lastly, rage against you who have never themselves been led astray by an error like that which is misleading you. . . . But I, who have been long tossed to and fro, . . . and so slowly yielded myself to the merciful Physician who called me with His gentle voice, that He might clear away my darkness,—I, who long listened to and believed all the imaginations which fetter and ensnare you,—I am utterly unable so to rage. . . I ought now so to bear with you, and be patient with you, as my dearest friends were patient and bore with me when I was wandering in my madness and my blindness."[1] As we hear such

[1] I cannot refrain from giving these noble words in their completeness:—"Illi in vos sæviant, qui nesciunt cum quo labore verum inveniatur, et quam difficile caveantur errores. Illi in vos sæviant, qui nesciunt cum quantâ difficultate sanetur oculus interioris hominis, ut possit intueri solem suum. . . . Illi in vos sæviant qui nesciunt quibus suspiriis et gemitibus fiat, ut ex quantulacunque parte possit intelligi Deus. Postremo, illi in vos sæviant, qui nun-

words, our hearts burn within us. If it is but too easy to show that even he who uttered them could forget his own teaching, and speak hard and fierce words of the errors into which he had not himself fallen, that example of inconsistency is but another warning against the subtlety with which the spirit of bitterness may wind itself into our souls, even while we are making the loudest professions of charity. We do true honour to the memory of a great man when we strive to follow him, not in his hot zeal, but in his burning love.

And if this already is, and seems likely to become yet more, the question of our time, it is hardly less clear that it touches upon many other questions; that for many of them, if we answer it, it furnishes, in its turn, the answer. Questions are raised as to the inspiration, authority, trustworthiness, of the books

quem tali errore decepti sunt, quali vos deceptos vident. Ego autem, qui, diu multumque jactatus, tandem perspicere potui, quid sit illa sinceritas quæ sine inanis fabulæ narratione percipitur; qui vanas imaginationes animi mei variis opinionibus erroribusque collectas vix miser merui, Domino opitulante, convincere; qui me ad detergendam caliginem mentis tam tarde clementissimo Medico vocanti blandientique subjeci, qui diu flevi ut incommutabilis et immaculabilis substantia, concinentibus divinis libris, sese mihi persuadere intrinsecus dignaretur; qui denique omnia illa figmenta, quæ vos diuturnâ consuetudine implicatos et constrictos tenent, et quæsivi curiose, et adtente audivi, et temere credidi, et instanter quibus potui persuasi, et adversus alios pertinaciter, animoseque defendi, sævire in vos omnino non possum, quos sicut meipsum illo tempore, ita nunc debeo sustinere, et tantâ patientiâ vobiscum agere, quantâ mecum egerunt proximi mei, cum in vestro dogmate rabiosus et cæcus errarem."—*Cont. Epist. Manich.*, c. 2.

of the Old Testament. In part, of course, these must stand or fall on their own grounds, and we may be content that the battle should be fought out there. Evidence of date, authorship, compilation, must be sifted, arbitrary assumptions on either side rejected. But if the study of the life of Christ leads us to accept with full, strong faith the Church's teaching, or if, falling short of that, it should lead us to see in Him at least the crown and perfection of humanity, then that issue of it can scarcely fail to throw some light upon those other problems that belong to an earlier time. The books which were the appointed sustenance of that perfect life, in which He acknowledged the teaching of His Father, in which He saw the lineaments of His own life and work portrayed distinctly, which were His weapons in the crises and conflicts of His life,—these, though it may be right and wise to study them as the literature of a nation in connection with its history, must yet be something more than the literature of other nations. If we may not press the argument from that authority beyond its limits, to books or passages which do not come within its range, or to questions which apparently, at least, lay outside His work as the revealer of His Father's will, His reverence for the Law and the Prophets should surely be the standard of our reverence. His recognition

that parts at least of that Law were given "because of the hardness of men's hearts,"[1] that the work of the prophets had been to utter their protest against hypocrisy and formalism, that the history of Israel was a witness not for, but against all national exclusiveness, that the highest ethical and spiritual truths were to be found where no scribe or Rabbi had ever found them or dreamt of looking for them,—this may well indicate to us the method of our study, and teach us to recognize stages of progress, degrees of illumination, pregnant hints, scattered here and there, half unconsciously, it may be, by the writer.

Or think again of the bearing of this life, so human, so divine, on the questions which are every day gaining a fresh prominence in men's minds as to the order and course of Nature. Is the law of an invariable succession of phænomena the one fact beyond which we cannot go, the limit of our knowledge of the universe? Do we reject the conception of a Will presiding over all successions, expressing itself in all laws, as belonging only to the earlier stage of scientific culture, not coming now within the horizon of the true thinker? Is law for us identified with the denial of will, and then set in the throne left vacant in the heavens, and worshipped as the one God and

[1] Matt. xix. 8.

Lord of the universe? Or, shrinking from this, do we fall back into the older scepticism which plays with a theory of probabilities, and pronounces that the credibility of an alleged miracle must always be less probable than the credulity or fraud of those who report it? Or, again, rising to a higher region, do we rest upon the thought that there is something unworthy of a supreme eternal Will in acts which look like suspensions of an appointed order to meet unforeseen contingencies; that, just as a mechanism of human structure is perfect in proportion as it does not depend for its action on the constant guidance or interference of a human will, so the Divine framework of the universe, assumed to be perfect because Divine, must go on for ever, if it did not start from self-evolving forces, with no variableness or shadow of turning? Or yet once more, passing from what men affirm or reject as miraculous, can we recognize the presence of a supreme Mind, wise and good, in facts which do not transcend the common course of nature, in which we can trace effects to causes, phænomena to laws, and, in part at least, are able to forecast the future? Is Nature, even in all her uniformity of succession, stamped with the impress of a Will sovereign and supernatural? I do not say that the difficulties which cluster round these questions can all be solved,

or that the scientific solution of them is to be found in the Gospel history, but it presents some thoughts which help us to struggle onward with steadier feet, and to believe where we do not see. The life of Him who has drawn all men to Him by the truth and holiness of His nature, who has given mankind (I use no other word than might be used by one farthest removed from the faith of His disciples) the noblest and purest of all creeds, is interwoven with, and inseparable from, the supernatural. Whatever portions of the narrative may be rejected as mythical in character or of doubtful origin, the smallest residuum that is left leaves us no other conception than that of One who, at least believed Himself, and was believed by others, to possess a wonder-working power, who asserted His own authority over nature in word and act, and where the common order of succession was not broken, taught men to believe that not "one sparrow fell to the ground," and not "one hair of their head should perish," without their Father's will.[1] If this belief were but the "baseless fabric of a vision,"—if the higher men's hopes, the deeper their trust, the closer their nearness to what we have learnt to think of as the Divine life, so much the farther are they from the stern reality of truth,—what remains but the

[1] Matt. x. 29; Luke xxi. 18.

dreary darkness of a life without hope and without God? "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

πάντα γέλως καὶ πάντα κόνις καὶ πάντα τὸ μηδέν.

The one refuge from the terrible Epicureanism of Lucretius,[1] or the lower sensuousness which characterized it in others, is taken from us. Why should we continue to admire the teacher who lived and died in a delusion? And, on the other hand, if the life leaves on us the impression of being not only the loftiest ideal, but the most real and living of all human lives,—if we learn to believe that He was neither deceived Himself, nor the worshipper of a *Deus quidam deceptor*,—will it not help us to endure till all things shall be made clear, seeing in all laws that we can trace, the finger-prints of a Divine will, owning a law above the law, as we see star beyond star and glory beyond glory, but believing that there is one supreme Will which has determined all from the beginning, and that from that Centre and Source of all laws the natural and the supernatural are seen as one, the spiritual and the material as necessary

[1] I cannot but feel thankful that one of the foremost scholars of our time has, in his masterly edition of Lucretius, helped to revive the study of the greatest of Latin poets. Though compelled to differ from Mr. Munro in my estimate of the influence of the system of Epicurus on art and literature, I am glad that students of religious history should have their attention drawn to the effect of its negation of all higher thoughts of the universe on a mind naturally so noble.

complements of each other, and working as He wills?

Two dangers are close at hand in such a study as I have suggested, both for teachers and hearers. There is, on the one hand, the risk arising from the fact that all the main facts of the life, all the main discussions that gather round it, are to most of us familiar things. Every narrative in the Gospel history has been known to us from childhood. We are well-nigh wearied with the questions of chronology, topography, archæology, with which commentaries abound. And yet I believe that now, more than ever, we may say that the full mines of knowledge which the Gospel history partly contains and partly points to, are only beginning to be explored. There is hardly a Life of Jesus, whatever shade of error or unbelief it may represent, hardly a single article in commentary or dictionary, hardly a single record of the wanderings of a thoughtful or observant man over the sacred land, hardly a single inquiry into the history of Jewish or heathen thought up to the time of the fulness of the ages, which we have not felt, many of us, as giving a clearer insight than we had before, and making the long-buried past live once again.[1] Materials for true historical pictures are

[1] It may be well to note those to whose labours in the last few years we are

richer and more abundant than they ever were before, and the very effort to complete them can hardly be without its gain. Failure is as probable here as it is in other like attempts,—more probable in proportion to the greatness of the subject,—but it will arise in every case from the unskilfulness of the artist, not from the poverty of what he has to deal with. And even with failure, partial or complete, in the attempts of individual writers, it cannot but be good to cease to look at the Gospel history through the disguising medium of the bright colours and fantastic forms of mediæval art, or the higher but not more truthful beauty of Raphael or Da Vinci, and to approach, at least, to seeing it as men saw it then, as it actually was.

The other risk of which I spoke is a far graver one. The life that we are studying may seem to us so very

most indebted. Among these, Dean Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine* will probably long continue pre-eminent; but his work has been worthily followed up by Mr. Grove in many able articles in Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, in Dr. Thomson's *The Land and the Book*, by Mr. Hepworth Dixon in *The Holy Land*, by Mr. Drew in his *Scripture Lands*. Dr. Robinson's more elaborate and exhaustive books, though not pictorial in their style, supply materials for pictures. Conybeare and Howson's *Life and Epistles of St. Paul* would have deserved almost the highest place in the list, were it not that their subject leads them, for the most part, outside the limits of the scenes of the Gospel history. Mr. Tristram's *The Land of Israel*, excellent in itself, gives good promise of what may be expected from the more systematic labours of the Palestine Exploration Society. To have identified Capernaum and ascertained the ground-plan of its synagogue, is at least a good beginning.

human that we may forget, even where we do not formally deny, that it is also Divine. The growth, progress, conflicts, of the Teacher and Prophet of Nazareth may lead us to forget that He is also the Son of the living God, before whose judgment-seat we shall all stand, who is the light and life of men, apart from whom there is no salvation or deliverance. The very clearness with which we see the lineaments of the Christ after the flesh may impede our seeing also the Christ who is risen, and ascended, and sitting at the right hand of the Father. No words of any human teacher can guard him or his hearers against that danger. But it is not peculiar to this study. It may, I believe, be more terribly near to us, more utterly destructive, when we, in our hot zeal and with our strife of words, are contending for the mystery of His Divine nature, or vindicating His atoning work. A Christ who is neither "after the flesh" nor "after the spirit," the *eidôlon* of human systems and speculations, this is a worse substitute for the form, at once human and Divine, than even the life, simply human, in which some have rested. To study the records of that life as on bended knees, and with the heart of prayer; to ask Him for light, guidance, truth; to feel that the Judge is looking on us, and already judging according as we love or hate the

light, this will guard us against the risk we dread; and then, in proportion as we have known Christ after the flesh, we may rise to the higher faith of the apostle, till at last we are able to say that now "we know Him so no more."[1] The manifestation of the humanity of Christ was, in the Divine development of truth, the appointed condition of the revelation of His Godhead; and what was the pathway marked out for access to the truth then will not fail us now.

[1] 2 Cor. v. 16.

II.

SOURCES FOR THE LIFE OF CHRIST.

II.

SOURCES FOR THE LIFE OF CHRIST.

AN inquiry into the sources from which we derive our materials for a life of Christ, calls for fuller and more detailed discussion than is suitable for this place. The questions which have been raised as to the authorship, date, character of each of the four Gospels,—those, yet more perplexing, which are connected with the relations of the first three to each other, and to the fourth, have occupied volumes, and with all rejection of whatever might be subordinate or irrelevant, would call, at least, for a somewhat long *excursus*. Postponing this, I confine myself to noting the chief facts which appear to be either obviously indisputable, or to have a distinct balance of probable evidence in their favour.

I. For all practical purposes, whatever we know of the life and teaching of our Lord is to be found in the four Gospels. Few facts are more striking in the early history of the Christian Church than the disappearance of what must once have been so widely known, the evanescence from men's memories of all the countless words and acts which crowded upon the mind of the beloved disciple, till it seemed to him that if they should be recorded every one, "the world itself would not contain the books that should be written."[1] One maxim meets us in the Acts of the Apostles which the Gospels do not record, "It is more blessed to give than to receive."[2] One addition in an early manuscript tells us that Jesus, as He passed by and saw a man working on the sabbath day, said to him, "If thou knowest what thou dost, then art thou blessed; but if thou knowest not, then art thou accursed."[3] Clement of Alexandria preserves the words which bade the disciples be "true exchangers," putting out and trafficking with what they had received, knowing how to refuse the counterfeit, and to choose the true and good.[4] But beyond these few instances, all search into early patristic literature is singularly disappointing. We are struck with the

[1] John xxi. 25.
[2] Acts xx. 35.
[3] Cod. D, after Luke vi. 4.
[4] Clem. Al., *Strom.*, i. 28.

utter want of this very power to distinguish between the true and the spurious, or to use the materials which lay within their reach, or to avoid the most glaring misconceptions of facts which seem to us clear and patent. One writer puts into the mouth of Christ a description of the millennial fertility of the earth which is as puerile as anything in the Talmud or the Koran.[1] Others speak of His ministerial work as having continued but for a single year, or having lasted till He had attained the age of nearly fifty,[2] or disfigure the narrative of His baptism with apocryphal additions.[3] Whatever light the writings of the earlier Fathers may throw on the Church's faith as to who

[1] The words are given by Irenæus (v. 33, 3) as having been preserved by Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, whom Eusebius describes as being of singularly poor and weak intellect :—"The days will come in which vines shall spring up, each having ten thousand stocks, and on each stock ten thousand branches, . . . and each grape, when pressed, shall give five-and-twenty measures of wine. And when any saint shall have seized one bunch, another shall cry, 'I am a better bunch; take me; through me bless the Lord.'"

It is possible, however, that this may have been something more than the mere dream of a sensuous millenarianism. In some phases of religious thought, fevered and excited, without the discipline of active work or mental culture, symbolism rapidly degenerates, and it may be that in what seems so puerile we have the distorted aftergrowth of the sublime truths of John xv. 1—6.

[2] The first statement is made by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.*, i. 21), and the second by Irenæus (ii. 33). Here the origin of the error is easily traceable. The diminution of the duration of our Lord's ministry was an inference from the "acceptable year" of Luke iv. 19 : the addition to the age from the question of the Jews, "Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast Thou seen Abraham?" (John viii. 57).

[3] Justin Martyr (*c. Tryph.*, 88), quoting from the Gospel of the Nazarenes, speaks of a bright fire shining round the Baptist as they stood in the Jordan.

and what He was—and they bear this testimony from the beginning; whatever help they may give to the interpretation of His words—and this they hardly do at all till we come to Origen, Augustine, Chrysostom,—we cannot turn to them for any material addition to our knowledge of His life.[1]

II. Still more utterly disappointing is any search into the apocryphal literature of early Christendom.[2] Elsewhere, though now perhaps with less confidence than formerly, we turn to the legends that precede history, with some hope of finding in them at least the scattered fragments of a past, helping us to reconstruct its whole fabric; but here we have the spurious and rank aftergrowth, which followed on what was, in every way, simpler and more historical. The chief, if not the only service that they render to the inquirer is by the contrast they present to the four of which the Church has been the witness and keeper, the impression they leave on the reader's mind that the writers of those four must have been altogether of a different stamp, standing in a different relation to the facts of which they

[1] The fullest collection of the fragmentary traditions thus preserved in early patristic writings is to be found in Appendix C to Mr. Westcott's *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels.*

[2] See Note C, on the Apocryphal Gospels in their Relation to Theology and Art.

write. From the Gospel of the Infancy to that of the Descent into Hell, we have nothing but the most irritating puerilities, always imbecile, not unfrequently prurient. We toil on through their weary pages, not, as in other researches, sifting the quartz and sand and earth, till at last we come on the solid nugget of a fact, but digging through heaps of rubbish, with nothing better to reward us at the end than some mouldering and worthless bones. What we have may make us thankful that we have no more; that of the many Gospels of this type which were once in circulation, the greater part have left us nothing but their names. The fire which tries every man's work of what sort it is, has in this instance burnt up the wood, hay, stubble, and left the gold and the silver and the precious stones.

III. The disappearance of another class of writings is, at first sight, matter more worthy of regret. The memoirs of the life of Christ which preceded the four extant Gospels, and from which three of them were in all probability compiled,—these, we may be disposed to think, would have given us much which would have been very precious. That such knowledge was widely diffused by oral teaching throughout the Church of the first century, that the writings which embodied it were neither few nor worthless, is

indisputable. Partly through want of care in noting the traces of them which the extant books of the New Testament present to us, partly through a vague assumption, contrary to all analogy, and contrary in this case to demonstrable facts, that no writings of apostles or prophets could have been allowed to perish, we have come to underrate the intellectual, one might almost say the literary, activity of that period, and to forget that the life and words of Christ must have left on the minds of tens of thousands a vivid and indelible impression, which many would carry with them wherever they went, and which some, at least, would endeavour to perpetuate in writing.

And yet so it evidently was. "Many had taken in hand," before St. Luke wrote, to "set forth in order" a narrative of the same character as his own.[1] It entered, as the same preface shows, into the catechetical instruction of every convert. Some collection of the "words of the Lord Jesus," other than any that we have, must have been in the hands or memories of the elders of Ephesus when St. Paul reminded them of their Master's teaching, that "it was more blessed to give than to receive;"[2] and that collection, or one like it, recognized in the same Church, was

[1] Luke i. 1. [2] Acts xx. 35.

authoritative enough to be quoted by the apostle as "Scripture" when he wrote to Timothy.[1] To the Corinthians had been preached a Gospel containing a full narrative of the night of the last supper, other than that of the extant Gospels—a record of the appearances of our Lord after His resurrection distinct from theirs.[2] And here, also, we may find traces of written as well as oral narrative. If the word Scripture was applied both by St. Peter and St. Paul to writings of the Christian as well as of the Jewish Church, the statement that Christ died for our sins, and rose again *according to the Scriptures*,[3]

[1] "The Scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn; and, The labourer is worthy of his hire" (1 Tim. v. 18). The last clause is found in our Lord's teaching in Matt. x. 10; Luke x. 7; but as there is a strong presumption against either of these having been in St. Paul's hands when he wrote to Timothy, the probable inference is that he referred to some lost document, the substance of which, wholly or in part, has been incorporated by the two evangelists in their narratives. Compare, again, the reference to the "words of our Lord Jesus Christ" in 1 Tim. vi. 3.

[2] 1 Cor. xi. 23—25; xv. 1—7. In both cases the narrative is given as one which he had received (*παρέλαβον*) and then delivered (*παρέδωκα*) to the churches which St. Paul formed. The stress laid on these two words makes it at least probable that the "traditions" (*παραδόσεις*) which formed the basis of all his teaching (2 Thess. ii. 15) included, as one important element, a narrative of the chief facts of the Gospel history. Such a narrative at any rate entered into the "Gospel" which he preached everywhere.

[3] I have elsewhere, in a sermon on the "Prophets of the New Testament" (*Theology and Life*, pp. 96—108), given my reasons for thinking that the common limitation, both of the "prophetic Scriptures" of Rom. xvi. 26, and the "prophecy of Scripture" of 2 Pet. i. 20, to the Old Testament, is against a preponderating weight of evidence. Assuming their applicability to New Testament writings, and the existence of such writings as known to the churches, it is, I think, legitimate to take the words of 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4 (analogous as they

may well be taken as an appeal to the authority of recognized histories, as well as to that of fulfilled prophecy. So before the Galatians the history of the crucifixion had been set forth with a vividness and fulness, which all but necessitates the existence of a written record.[1] The facts of the Gospel history, often even in their details, are presupposed as known. The birth of Christ, as of the house of David and the tribe of Judah,[2] the outward poverty of His life,[3] the work of the Baptist as preparing the way for His,[4] His life in Nazareth, the descent of the Spirit,[5] the temptation in the wilderness,[6] the meekness and gentleness which showed itself in look and word,[7] the signs and wonders which He wrought,[8] the glory of the transfiguration,[9] the agony in Gethsemane,[10] the silence before Caiaphas,[11] the good confession before Pilate,[12] the promise of His second coming,[13] the prediction of the fall of the temple,[14] echoes more

are to the formula "according to my Gospel"), with an equally wide range. The "Scriptures" of 2 Pet. iii. 16 may reasonably be thought of as including other *Christian* writings besides the Epistles of St. Paul.

[1] Gal. iii. 1. If these words do not point to an actual pictorial representation (and this is hardly conceivable), they at least imply vivid word-painting, which brought the facts of the death of Christ before the eyes of those who heard it.

[2] Rom. i. 3; Heb. vii. 14. [3] 2 Cor. viii. 9.

[4] Acts x. 37; xix. 4. [5] Acts x. 38. [6] Heb. ii. 18; iv. 15.

[7] 2 Cor. x. 1. [8] Acts x. 38. [9] 2 Pet. i. 17.

[10] Heb. v. 7. [11] 1 Pet. ii. 23. [12] 1 Tim. vi. 13.

[13] The Epistles, *passim*. [14] Heb. xii. 27.

or less distinct of the Lord's Prayer,[1] and the Sermon on the Mount,[2]—all these are found in scattered notices, mentioned familiarly as things well known. The life of which they all testified had been conspicuous enough. "This thing was not done in a corner." Eye-witnesses were to be found whose report was trustworthy.[3]

IV. Out of all these many writings we have but four. As the Pentateuch, on almost any tenable hypothesis of its origin, at least includes fragments of earlier works now lost; as the books of Samuel, and Kings, and Chronicles, are confessedly compilations from a multitude of lost annals and histories written by priests and prophets, so three out of the four bear every mark, in their agreement and their differences, of having been compiled in like manner from that diffused tradition and those many memoirs of the life of Christ. Our *data* for determining the sources and the order of compilation may be insufficient, the attempt to refer each section to its origin may lead to fantastic hypotheses, but it is in itself a permissible inquiry enough. We ought at least to remember,

[1] Acts xxi. 14; Gal. iv. 6; Rom. viii. 15.

[2] Jas. i. 22; ii. 8; iv. 13—17; v. 12.

[3] Compare the interesting and valuable *excursus* on "The Epistles to the Corinthians in relation to the Gospel History" in Dean Stanley's *Commentary*.

before we hastily condemn them, that the most complicated of all such schemes, that which most reminds us of the results of the application of the Elohistic and Jehovistic tests to the Book of Genesis, had the sanction of a Bishop of our own Church of unimpeached theological repute.[1]

How far the names which the prescriptive tradition of the Church has affixed to the four Gospels indicate actual authorship, has been and may be questioned. The substance of the books themselves contains no statement by the writer as to his own name and position; and the names affixed by transcribers are not in themselves more convincing than the headings, often doubtful, of the Psalms, or the notes, often misleading, appended to St. Paul's epistles. If other authorship than that commonly received were proved, we might have to confess that readers for eighteen centuries had been mistaken, but not that the writings had been put forth under false colours.[2] External evidence in support of that received belief varies in

[1] I refer, of course, to Bishop Marsh. For a masterly discussion of the principles of such an investigation see Bishop Thirlwall's Introduction to his translation of Schleiermacher on the Gospel of St. Luke.

[2] Even in the case of the fourth Gospel, which, on this hypothesis, would come most nearly under the stigma of simulated authorship, it must be remembered that, though the writer identifies himself with the "disciple whom Jesus loved" (John xxi. 24), the further identification with the son of Zebedee is the result, not of any statement of his, but partly of the tradition of the Church, and partly of comparison with the other Gospels.

kind and degree with each. Some portions of it are common to all.

(*a*) The proof that these four Gospels were known by these names goes back to the time of Papias (*circ.* A.D. 120-40), and Irenæus[1] (*circ.* A.D. 178), and they profess to record the testimony of a generation earlier than their own. The fact that they were so recognized, directly at the commencement of the second century, and inferentially at the close of the first, is of itself of some weight. It receives fresh force from the fact that so many other written records, more or less trustworthy, were allowed to perish and be forgotten.[2]

[1] I quote two or three of the more striking passages, and refer the student to the Introductions to Alford's or Wordsworth's Commentaries, or to Mr. Westcott's masterly treatise on the Canon of the New Testament. Papias is said by Eusebius (H. E., iii. 31) to have written a commentary on *The Words or Oracles of the Lord* (Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις). This implies the existence of one or more collections like that referred to in Acts xx. 35 and 1 Tim. vi. 3. Two of these he specifies:—"Matthew wrote his oracles (λόγια,—compare the use of the word in Rom. iii. 2) in Hebrew;" "Mark was the interpreter of Peter, and wrote what he remembered of the acts and words of Christ faithfully (ἀκριβῶς), though not in a formal order." This at least proves the existence of two books bearing their names then; and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, it is fair to assume their substantial identity with those which have borne the names since. To suppose that *two* spurious books would usurp the place of the originals, and thrust them into utter oblivion, is, at least, a bold hypothesis. In the time of Irenæus the four names are all recognized, and a history of each Gospel given.

[2] The formula which Justin always uses in quoting what he calls the "Memoirs (ἀπομνημονεύματα) of the Apostles," makes identification difficult. But in one passage (*Apol.* i. 66.) he himself identifies them with what were commonly known as "Gospels." It deserves to be noticed that Papias (*l. c.*) had

(*b*) The names themselves, in the case of all but the fourth Gospel, carry with them a presumption of their right to stand where they do. They are not those which would have occurred to an unknown compiler, wishing, either as a pious fraud, or from baser motives, to issue his narrative under the authority of a great name. One who desired to court the favour of the Jewish Church would hardly have fixed on the one among the Twelve on whom was fixed the indelible brand of "publican," of whom no single word or act is recorded after the "great feast" which followed his call to the discipleship. Other workers more conspicuous in the history of the Apostolic Church would have been chosen, than the half-hearted deacon who went back from the work to which he had set his hand, or the physician of Gentile birth, of whom, though he was the friend and companion of St. Paul, so little is known apart from the books which bear his name. If the argument is not applicable to the Gospel of St. John, if there we must admit the possibility of a desire to make the most of the reverence due to the best

used the cognate verb in his account. "Mark wrote as he remembered (ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευσε)." In both cases what is implied is the previous existence of a vast oral tradition, the παραδόσεις and παραθηκὴ of St. Paul's epistles; and Euseb. (*Dem. Evang.*, iii. 5) uses the self-same word as Justin (ἀπομνημονεύματα) of St. Mark's Gospel.

beloved and last survivor of the Twelve, we may set against that admission the fact that here,[1] by the confession of the boldest among recent critics, the evidence of personality is clearest and least disputable.

(*c*) The received hypothesis may at least be submitted to one test. If we find, as we apply it to the Gospels one by one, that internal evidence falls in with the external tradition, that coincidences, manifestly undesigned, multiply around us the more carefully we explore the facts, that the hypothesis offers in each case an explanation of special phænomena hardly to be accounted for otherwise, and is not contradicted by any, it may well claim to satisfy the conditions of trustworthiness more thoroughly.

Such an inquiry presupposes that we may and ought to study the Gospels in connexion, not only with their subject-matter, but with the position, character, and even motives of the writer. Our own school of interpretation has commonly turned aside, with a strange self-complacency which it mistook for reverence, from such a method. Elsewhere it has, perhaps, been carried to excess. As with other books, so with these, there is the risk of arbitrary

[1] I refer principally to Ewald, *Über die Johanneischen Schriften*, p. 43; and Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, p. xxvii.; *Les Apôtres*, p. ix. Schleiermacher's testimony may be added as on the same side.

combinations, conclusions indefinitely wider than the premises, hypotheses more or less fantastic. We need to take every step warily. But the method itself is surely a legitimate one, likely to lead to truth. There must have been a time when what is now so familiar was first heard from human lips, or put on record by human hands, when the writer sat down to his task with full memory, or with many documents, reproducing what he himself had seen and heard, or what eye-witnesses had told him, with a mind trained in a given school of thought, contemplating a given class of readers, determined, consciously or unconsciously, as to the form and substance of his narrative, by the antecedent conditions of his life. To arrive at a clearer view of what must have been so important an element in the origination of the four Gospels may help us to see more distinctly the lineaments of the Son of Man portrayed, as from different points of view, in each of them. In proportion as we believe the writers to have been under the teaching of a Spirit higher than their own, must we look with profounder reverence at what then assumes the character of a Divine education fitting men for a Divine work.[1]

[1] Of the many treatises dealing with this subject, I know none more thorough, more honest, and more thoughtful, than Mr. Westcott's chapter on "The Characteristics of the Four Gospels" in his *Introduction* (chap. iv.)

(1.) There are, I believe, good grounds for accepting the conclusion of most recent critics, that in the Gospel according to St. Mark we have the nearest representative of the first systematic teaching of the Church of the Apostles as to the life and teaching of their Lord.[1] There may have been narratives, oral or written, antecedent to it, upon which it may have in part been based, but it bears upon it, at once in its brevity of plan and its fulness of detail, traces of distinct originality. Here, more than in any other of the three Gospels, there are, as has been often noticed, vivid pictorial touches which speak of knowledge such as belongs to an eye-witness. The scene of the "green grass" in Bethsaida, and the groups (*συμπόσια*) in which the multitude arranged themselves by hundreds and fifties, as at a great public feast, like so many flower-beds (*πρασιαὶ*) in an ordered garden;[2] the dashing of the waves in the ship while our Lord was sleeping on the boat's cushion in the stern;[3] the smaller

[1] The older view that St. Mark's Gospel was an abridgment may now fairly be considered as not only obsolescent but exploded. Without assuming its identity with the *Protevangelium*, the first written narrative of our Lord's work, it bears every trace at once of being earlier than St. Matthew, and independent of it. Here, again, the materials for the inquiry are to be found in most commentaries. Mr. Kenrick's interesting monograph on the Gospel of St. Mark, in his volume of *Biblical Studies*, deserves special mention.

[2] Mark vi. 39, 40.

[3] Mark iv. 36—38. Note specially the touch of personal reminiscence in the

craft that accompanied the ship of the disciples;[1] the touches of personal knowledge in the history of the demoniac who plucked asunder his chains and ground his fetters together till they were broken;[2] and of the woman with the issue of blood, who had suffered many things of many physicians, and had spent all that she had;[3] the reproduction of the very words belonging to another speech than that in which he wrote, *Ephphatha*,[4] *Talitha cumi*,[5] *Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani*;[6] of the glance and gesture with which the Lord looked round in anger at the hardness of men's hearts,[7] or in pity and yearning love upon the rich young ruler,[8] or in approving welcome to the disciples whom He claimed as His true kindred;[9] the special notice of the strange apparition in Gethsemane of the young man with the linen cloth cast around his naked body,—these are but a few of a long list of details of like nature,[10] and the conclusion from them is all

words, "They receive Him *as He was*"—worn and spent with the long day's work, as in John iv. 6, He "being weary sat *thus* on the well." It is interesting to note how this characteristic agrees with the language of Papias: "Mark wrote with exact minuteness (ἀκριβῶς) . . . as he remembered."

[1] Mark iv. 36—38.

[2] Mark v. 2—6. [3] Mark v. 25, 26. [4] Mark vii. 34. [5] Mark v. 41.

[6] Mark xv. 34. [7] Mark iii. 5. [8] Mark x. 21. [9] Mark iii. 34.

[10] I add two or three of the more striking:—(1.) The statement that Jesus was "with the wild beasts" in the wilderness (i. 13). (2.) The name, Bartimæus, of

but irresistible. How the knowledge came is of course another question.

Identifying the writer to whom the Gospel is ascribed with the "John surnamed Mark" of the Acts and Epistles (there is no other Mark known to us in the first century who could have written it, or to whom men would have been tempted to ascribe it), we must hold it to have been possible that he may have himself been a disciple during part of the ministry of Christ. Residing with his mother at Jerusalem,[1] he may at least have seen and heard something of what he puts on record. On the other hand, the relation in which he stood to Barnabas makes it probable that his full acceptance of the faith coincided with his uncle's,[2] and in that case we have to look elsewhere for the sources of his knowledge.

The old tradition, so early as to amount almost to direct history, that the writer was the companion and interpreter of Peter,[3] falls in with every fact which the books of the New Testament record of him. It

---

the blind man at Jericho; and his cry, "Rabboni;" and *his flinging off his garment* (x. 46—52). (3.) The mention of Simon of Cyrene, the father of Alexander and Rufus, as being seized to bear the cross (xv. 21). (4.) The parable, not elsewhere found, of "the blade, the ear, the full corn in the ear" (iv. 26—28).

[1] Acts xii. 12. [2] Acts iv. 36; Col. iv. 10.

[3] Papias, *l. c.*, in Euseb., H. E., iii. 39. Irenæus, iii. 1.

was to his mother's house that Peter went after his release from prison.[1] He was as much the son of that apostle by spiritual parentage as Timotheus was of Paul.[2] It was after long intercourse with him and the other apostles that he went forth with Paul and Barnabas to his missionary work.[3] When his heart failed him, he returned to him at Jerusalem.[4] If at some later period he once again shared the labours of St. Paul, and was "profitable to him for the ministry,"[5] he yet gravitated, as it were, to the Apostle of the Circumcision, and like Silvanus, was with him in his old age, when he wrote his two epistles to the Churches.[6] In the second of those epistles (I assume a genuineness which I look on as almost demonstrable,[7]) the apostle, contemplating his own decease, speaks of his intention to enable the Asiatic Churches to "have in remembrance" the facts and words which he contrasts with the "cunningly devised fables" of other teachers, it may be, with apocryphal Gospels; and there was no one so likely to be his helper in that work as the disciple whom he had adopted as a son. Here, then, we have tradition from without coinciding at once with the internal evidence of the Gospel itself,

[1] Acts xii. 12. [2] 1 Pet. v. 13. [3] Acts xiii. 5.
[4] Acts xiii. 13. [5] 2 Tim. iv. 11. [6] 1 Pet. v. 13.
[7] See Note D, on the Relation of the two Epistles of St. Peter to the Gospel of St. Mark.

and with intimations scattered here and there in other books, as to the writer. One who had heard from Peter's lips many of the facts which he records was likely to have heard them in all the distinctness and vividness which belong to an eye-witness, on whom they had made, when they happened, an indelible impression.

The fact thus established helps us to understand the character of the book. The Gospel is as the apostle was in his work and in his writings. It is stamped with the catholicity of which the name of Peter was rightly the representative. It is not pre-eminently a Gospel for the Hebrews as was that of St. Matthew, nor for the Gentiles as was that of St. Luke, but gives what belonged equally to both, even as Peter was at once the Apostle of the Circumcision, and yet was chosen to open the door of faith to the Gentiles. It bears not a few traces, in what it narrates and in what it omits, of Peter's personal influence.[1] It indicates what the Gospel history itself shows throughout of Peter, a mind more impressible by looks, acts, short pregnant sayings, than receptive of systematic teaching, and so we have neither the full

[1] One may note the vividness of the description of the scene in Peter's house (i. 29—31), and of the account of the Transfiguration (ix. 2—5); the omission of the words, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church." The list might be enlarged, but not without some risk of arbitrary and subjective inferences.

report of parables and discourses, as in St. Matthew and St. Luke, nor the higher teaching preserved to us by St. John. There are no traces, in the case of St. Peter, of any close intimacy with the mother of our Lord, or the circle of devout women who gathered round her; and this may in part account for St. Mark's omission of the history of the Nativity and Infancy. In part, also, that omission represents the fact, to which the Acts of the Apostles testify, that the Nativity was not prominent in the teaching of St. Peter, nor probably in that of the Jewish Church generally; that they rested the Messiahship of Jesus, rested even their belief in His Divinity, on other grounds than that,—on His being "approved by miracles, and wonders, and signs," on His being "anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power," on His resurrection from the dead.[1]

What has been said falls in with yet another characteristic of this Gospel. Whether, with some, we connect it with the tradition that he wrote pre-eminently for a people of action rather than thought,[2]

[1] Comp. Acts ii. 22, 24; v. 31.

[2] I refer, of course, to the tradition that it was at Rome that he acted as the interpreter of Peter, and that for that Church, in the first instance, he wrote his Gospel, as embodying the substance of Peter's teaching (Clem. Alex., *Hypot.*, p. 1016; Euseb., H. E., vi. 14). The mention of Rufus in Mark xv. 21 as compared with Rom. xvi. 13 suggests an incidental confirmation of the tradition.

finding their ideal of excellence in obedience to a law; or, with others, see in it the impression left by his experience as a Levite in the temple service,[1] or his work as the deacon-minister attending on apostles; it is at least hardly open to doubt that the prominent aspect of our Lord's life presented by St. Mark is not that of the priest, the prophet, or the king, but that of "the servant of the Lord," prompt and ready in His obedience.[2] The favourite word of the Gospel is "straightway," "immediately."[3] With an almost startling iteration it is used again and again of His own personal acts, of the effects of His word or work, of the disciples who followed His example. Precisely the same thought characterizes the language of St. Peter. He, too, delights to dwell on the phase of his Master's life embodied in the name of the "holy servant of the Lord."[4] When he speaks to the servants of

[1] The relationship to Barnabas (Col. iv. 10) makes it certain that he was a Levite on his mother's side, and probable that he was so on the father's. If so, the fact accounts for his passing from his ministerial work in the liturgical order of the temple to an analogous office in the Christian Church. He is the minister (ὑπηρέτης) of Paul and Barnabas; profitable for the ministry (εἰς διακονίαν, 2 Tim. iv. 11); and the earliest apostolic father dwells elaborately on the parallelism between the Levite-service in the temple, and the diaconate of the Christian Church (Clem. Rom., i. 40).

[2] I owe this thought to an interesting though little known book, *The Characteristic Differences of the Four Gospels*, by Andrew Jukes, p. 93.

[3] The words (εὐθέως, εὐθύς) occur not less than forty-five times in St. Mark's sixteen chapters. In all the rest of the New Testament forty-seven times.

[4] Acts iv. 27, 30. Our version, "Thy holy child Jesus," is at once inaccurate, and misleading as to the whole tenor of the hymn. Its obvious purpose

heathen or Christian masters, it is to direct their thoughts to Christ as leaving them an example, in the very words in which Isaiah had described that servant as obedient even unto death.[1] We need not wonder to find this agreement in their leading thoughts, accompanied by numerous coincidences even in words or phrases, strengthening by an accumulative proof what seemed probable before. That proof cannot now be entered on, but with so many lines of evidence converging, we may well rest in the belief that the Gospel of St. Mark embodies the recollections of St. Peter.[2]

(2.) The questions which Biblical scholars have so often debated, whether the Gospel of St. Matthew had a Hebrew original, and was or was not identical with the Gospel according to the Hebrews, lie beyond our present scope. Few will be found to dispute the statement that it was written by a Jew for the Church of the Circumcision. The stress laid from the very first on the fulfilment of the words of prophets, the absence of any explanation of Israelite words or customs, the genealogy traced after the Hebrew law of succession, from Abraham down-

is to identify the Lord Jesus with "the servant of the Lord" who forms the central figure in the later prophecies that bear the name of Isaiah.

[1] 1 Pet. ii. 18—24; Isa. liii. 9. [2] See Note D.

wards, the stress laid on the title of the Son of David,—all these confirm the early tradition that he wrote to bring out especially the Messiahship of Jesus, His true kingly character, His office as sent especially to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. These facts have been often noticed, and are familiar enough to most of us. Another which points in the same direction, and is suggestive of new thoughts, has perhaps hardly met with the attention it deserves. If we were asked what portion of St. Matthew's Gospel is pre-eminently its characteristic glory, we should point, without a moment's hesitation, to the Sermon on the Mount. If we were asked which of the Epistles bears the closest resemblance in broad outlines of thought, in minute details of teaching, to that Divine discourse, we should point as unhesitatingly to the Epistle of St. James. Many as are the echoes of the personal teaching of Christ that meet us in the writings of His disciples, this is beyond all doubt the clearest. The mind of the brother of the Lord is in harmony with that of the publican of Capernaum. The writer of the Gospel meant especially for his Hebrew brethren would naturally be in close contact with the Bishop of Jerusalem.[1]

[1] There may have been a yet closer connection. In the list of the apostles

That a narrative written by one of the chosen Twelve should have much in common with what was derived immediately from another—that the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark should cover the same ground, is no matter for surprise.[1] Something may perhaps be gained of additional interest and insight, if we are able to connect what is peculiar to St. Matthew with the special discipline of his life. As a publican hated and despised, he must have felt as one practically excommunicated by the religious teachers of his countrymen. Not for him, or for others like him, were their expositions of the law, their rules of life, the

we find a James the son of Alphæus (Matt. x. 3; Mark iii. 18). In the history of the call of Levi (= Matthew), he is described by the same title (Mark ii. 14). This makes him probably the son of the sister of our Lord's mother (John xix. 25); and although the identity of James the brother of the Lord with the son of Alphæus remains an open question, it is hardly open to doubt that the Evangelist and the Bishop of Jerusalem were united by close ties of consanguinity. The new name, Matthew (= Θεόδωρος, Adeodatus, *God-given*), embodies the teaching of the epistle (Jas. i. 5, 17). See Note E, on the Epistle of St. James in its Bearing upon the Gospel of St. Matthew.

[1] Mr. Westcott (*Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, chap. iii.) gives numerical estimates of the portions in which the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark coincide verbally or substantially. Taking the total number of coincidences in the Gospels at one hundred, those in which the two agree are 73. The Eusebian Canons give the instances of agreement thus:—St. Mark with the other three, 72; with St. Matthew and St. Luke, 111; with St. Matthew alone, 48. The difference of order, however, and the independence indicated by the greater vividness of St. Mark, are against the notion that he abridged St. Matthew. The natural inference is that they drew from some common source. Whether that was strictly *the Protevangelium*, or one out of many such, is, of course, an open question.

parables of their doctors.[1] To such a mind no contrast could be greater than that between the old teachers who cast him out, and the new Teacher, the new Rabbi, who called and accepted him. It would be to him, of all disciples, a welcome and congenial task to collect what he had heard himself, or what had been reported to him by others—to reproduce it with a fulness which did not come within the reach of the less receptive mind of St. Peter. Here was One who, if, on the one hand, He taught as "one having authority, and not as the Scribes,"[2] taught also "not as the Scribes" in His love and tenderness. If the publican of Capernaum were like him of Jericho,[3] then the thought that he, too, had been recognized as a son of Abraham would be one of joy and exultation to him, and he would delight in gathering all that pointed to the inheritance of the patriarch's seed, in tracing all the marvellous coincidences, real or verbal, between the language of the prophets, spoken apparently in reference to other times and persons, and the facts of his Master's life.

Another characteristic specially distinctive of St.

[1] The tendency to a theological aristocracy, confining religious culture to men of ease and leisure, appears, at least in germ, in Ecclus. xxxviii. 33. It reached its highest point in the words of the Pharisees, "This people that knoweth not the law are cursed" (John vii. 49).

[2] Matt. vii. 29.

[3] Luke xix. 9.

Matthew, is, of course, his history of the Infancy. Whence, we ask, did he learn what had passed, much of it in the profoundest secrecy, of which the Gospel of St. Mark makes no mention? I venture to think that the connection already pointed out between his Gospel and the Epistle of St. James, suggests the true answer. Through him, the "brother of the Lord," who stood in a filial relationship of some kind (I do not pause now to inquire what),[1] to her who was blessed among women, who had grown up in ignorance, and had continued, it may be, in doubt and unbelief up to the very close of the life of his brother and his Lord, but then had passed to the fullest faith, owning Him as Searcher of hearts, the true Son of David, Christ the Lord, the Judge standing at the door,[2] St. Matthew *may* (is it too much to say *must?*) have learned the mystery of

[1] It is not necessary to discuss the question, but I may venture to express my own conviction that the position maintained by Dr. Mill (*The Accounts of our Lord's Brethren*, &c.), following Jerome, that the brethren and sisters of the Lord were children of His mother's sister, is practically unassailable. If a false reverence for the Virgin has sometimes biassed men's minds unduly in favour of that conclusion, and prior to an examination of the evidence on which it rested, it must be admitted, I think, that a still falser Protestantism has led men, both in earlier and later times, to embrace the opposite hypothesis (originated by Helvidius) of uterine fraternity. Professor Lightfoot has recently, in his *Commentary on the Galatians*, put forth an elaborate vindication of the Epiphanian theory that they were the children of Joseph by a former marriage, but the balance of evidence still seems, I think, on the side of that of Jerome.

[2] Jas. ii. 1; v. 8, 9; Acts xv. 16.

that birth, the genealogy of inheritance which the heirs of the house of David treasured up, the visit of the wise men, the flight into Egypt. How such a record met the cravings of men's hearts,—met even more, perhaps, the yearnings of the hearts of women, —we may judge from the hold which the history of the Nativity has in all ages had upon countless thousands of loving and childlike hearts. We may rejoice and give thanks that those wants were and are met in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke. How possible it was that there might be minds in an earlier or more advanced stage, resting more on the outward activity or the transcendent greatness of His manhood, who did not dwell on it, who were guided (if we accept the fact of inspiration) to make no mention of it in their record of the life of Christ, we may infer from its absence from the Gospels of St. Mark and St. John.[1]

(3.) The sources of St. Luke's knowledge, the purpose and character of his Gospel (assuming this authorship), the position which it occupies in relation to other books of the New Testament, all this

[1] Is it fanciful to note, before passing on, the further coincidences—(1) That it is the publican who records with most fulness his Master's rebuke of the Scribes and Pharisees who had scorned him (ch. xxiii.); and (2) that he who had been accustomed to collect one kind of tribute at Capernaum, is the one evangelist who relates (xvii. 24—27) what passed between our Lord and the collectors of the Temple rate?

stands out in daylight clearness. The Gospel of St. Paul's companion is essentially Pauline. When the apostle refers to the facts of the Gospel history, it is chiefly (though, as we have seen, not exclusively) to the record of this evangelist. As the Acts of the Apostles bears unmistakeable traces of being, so to speak, an *Eirenicon* between the two great parties of the Apostolic Church—a record showing that Cephas and Paul, instead of being the heads of rival schools, were at heart one, fellow-workers with God in the same great work of throwing open the door of faith to the Gentiles, one developing and completing what the other had begun,[1] so in the Gospel we may trace the same golden thread giving unity and plan to the whole narrative. If we would

[1] I am not deterred, by the fact that this characteristic has been dwelt on by M. Renan (*Les Apôtres*, p. xxiv.), following Baur and Bauer, in his keenest style of *persiflage*, from adhering to a conviction formed long before his book was published, based upon evidence which I hold to be irresistible, and quite compatible, I believe, with the fullest reverence and loyalty to the faith of Christendom. If the book professed to be a complete critical history of the Christian Church, the omission of the later movements of the Judaizing party would, of course, be a serious defect. Being what it is, a brief memoir of its growth, and of the labours of St. Peter and St. Paul in connexion with it, for the use of a Gentile convert, it would have been almost as serious a defect to have given undue prominence to obsolete quarrels, and to have raked up (in the absence of any necessity like that which compelled St. Paul to mention it) the scandal of Peter's momentary weakness. Was it strange that the friend of St. Paul should have written in the same spirit as the apostle himself, to show that "Paul and Apollos and Cephas" were instruments in God's hands for building up His Church (1 Cor. iii. 22)?

understand this Gospel, we must first picture to ourselves what it must have been for a heathen physician[1] to find himself drawn to undertake the task of recording the words and acts of the Messiah of the Jews; how welcome, in proportion as he was drawn to admiration, reverence, love, worship, would be all tokens that he, too, was accepted as an heir of the kingdom. If the Acts were written to prove the unity of St. Peter and St. Paul, the Gospel was to show that no width nor freedom of theirs went beyond the width and freedom of their Lord. Every act and word is treasured up which bore record of that. The discourse at Nazareth, pointing to the fact that blessings were bestowed on Sidonian widows and Syrian lepers which were not bestowed on Israelites;[2] the rebuke of James and John when they knew not what manner of spirit they were of;[3] the parable of the Good Samaritan, and the Prodigal Son, and the lost Sheep, and the lost Piece of Money; the welcome to Zacchæus,[4] the promise to the repentant thief,[5] the mission of the seventy, corresponding to the ideal number of the nations of the Gentiles,[6] and

[1] The Gentile birth is inferred from the line of demarcation drawn by St. Paul between "those of the circumcision" and "Luke, the beloved physician," Col. iv. 11, 14.

[2] Luke iv. 25—27. [3] Luke ix. 53—56. [4] Luke xix. 9. [5] Luke xxiii. 43.

[6] Luke x. 1. The symbolic meaning of the number is adopted by Ellicott (*Hulsean Lectures*, p. 256) on the authority of Eisenmenger and Lightfoot.

the genealogy running up to the great father of the human race; the history of the Samaritan leper,[1] and the believing centurion,[2] and the woman that was a sinner,[3] are subservient to the same purpose. Less important dogmatically, but not less striking as showing the unity of character in the two books, is the stress laid in the Gospels on the personal poverty of Christ,[4] on His protests against covetousness,[5] on the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, on His woes against the rich and blessings on the poor,[6] on His precept, "Sell that ye have, and give alms,"[7] and in the Acts on the marvellous spectacle of that first overflowing love, when men had all things in common, and sold their lands and goods, and brought the price, and laid it at the apostles' feet.[8]

The well-known transitions in the Acts from the third person to the first, and back again to the

---

The quotations given by the latter (*Hor. Heb.*, on John vii. 37) leave no doubt that the symbolism was at once popular and intelligible. At the Feast of Tabernacles, seventy oxen were offered for the nations of the heathen world, and this feast came immediately before the mission of the seventy disciples. It has to be noticed, too, (1) that there is here no limitation of the work of the preacher to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, as in Matt. x. 5, 6; (2) that this mission occurs towards the close of His ministry, after He had been rejected both at Capernaum and Jerusalem; (3) that at or about this time the Jews, as if suspecting the coming expansion of His work, ask tauntingly, "Will He teach the Gentiles?" (John vii. 35).

[1] Luke xvii. 11—19. [2] Luke vii. 9. [3] Luke vii. 36—50.
[4] Luke ix. 58. [5] Luke xii. 13—21. [6] Luke vi. 20.
[7] Luke xii. 33. [8] Acts ii. 44—46; iv. 34—37.

third,[1] point to some facts which are at least suggestive. The evangelist and physician is the companion of St. Paul in his voyage from Troas to Philippi, must probably have seen him again on the second journey through Macedonia to Achaia, joined him on his last visit to Jerusalem, and apparently never afterwards left him. There are distinct traces that on each of these occasions the apostle had suffered more acutely than usual from that sharp and painful disease, neuralgic or inflammatory, which he describes as a "thorn in his flesh,"[2] and we can well understand how his advancing age and increasing infirmities might at once have determined the physician to devote his life to the work of accompanying the apostle, and made the apostle more than ever grateful for that devotion.

[1] The first person appears suddenly in Acts xvi. 10, and lasts till ver. 17. It reappears in xx. 6, and continues to ver. 16; takes a fresh start in xxvii. 1; and is kept up as far as xxviii. 16. Comp. Irenæus iii. 14.

[2] I adopt with most recent commentators (Alford, Stanley, Meyer) this view of the trial which St. Paul (2 Cor. xii. 7) describes by this mysterious name. Ancient tradition (Tertull., *De Pudic.*," c. 13; Hieron., *Ad Gal.*, iv. 13) speaks of sharp pain in the head. It seems probable, from Gal. iv. 15,—"ye would have plucked out your eyes, and given them to me,"—combined with vi. 11, and 2 Cor. xii. 10, that it also affected sight, and was repulsive in appearance. What has to be noticed is, that shortly before the first occurrence of the first person on the apostle's arrival at Troas, there had been the dangerous and painful illness referred to in Gal. iv. 13, 14; and that in like manner, shortly before its reappearance on his return to Philippi, there had been the all but fatal attack mentioned in 2 Cor. i. 8; iv. 10, 12, 16.

The close agreement of St. Paul's account of the last supper with that given by St. Luke[1] makes it all but certain that, so far as the Gospel which he preached embodied a narrative, it must have been part of that which now bears that evangelist's name. Of the many conjectures as to "the brother whose praise is in the Gospel throughout all the churches," that which identifies him with St. Luke, and refers the almost unique expression to the repute which he already possessed as a compiler of the chief facts as to the life and teaching of Christ, has, I believe, a large balance of probability in its favour.[2]

But it has to be noted that when St. Paul and St. Luke met at Troas, it was not as strangers. They must have known each other before, and every-

[1] Comp. 1 Cor. xi. 23—25; Luke xxii. 19, 20.

[2] 2 Cor. viii. 18. Here, as in the question as to the brethren of the Lord, a probable opinion seems to have been somewhat hastily rejected *because* it was traditional and patristic. The points which appear almost, if not altogether, conclusive are (1) that the "Gospel," in St. Paul's language, distinctly included a narrative of facts (1 Cor. xv. 1—3); that the "brother" in question is sent from Macedonia, probably from Philippi, where the narrative of Acts xvi. left St. Luke; (3) that he was chosen by the Macedonian churches to travel with St. Paul to Jerusalem (2 Cor. viii. 19), and that this tallies with the reappearance of the first person, and its continuance during St. Paul's journey thither; (4) that while the list of companions in Acts xx. 4 includes representatives of the churches of Berœa, Thessalonica, Asia, and Derbe, none are mentioned as belonging to Philippi, and that it is therefore natural to infer that its unnamed delegate is the writer of the narrative. I cannot find anything like the same amount of evidence in favour of Tychicus, or Trophimus, or Aristarchus; and to the two former there is the distinct objection that they were Asiatics, and not Macedonians.

thing in the Acts leads us to the conclusion that their friendship had begun at Antioch. That city is, in fact, the centre of the Gentile Church throughout the book, as Jerusalem is of the Church of the Circumcision. The prominence given to the arrival there of the men of wider thoughts who left Jerusalem after the death of Stephen, and then of the men of Cyprus and Cyrene who took the bold step of preaching to the heathen, and then of Barnabas and Saul; the stress laid on the new name of Christian as originating there,[1] and on the liberality of that Church to the poor at Jerusalem; the list of prophets conspicuous there, but, with the exception of Paul and Barnabas, not otherwise memorable,[2] are all indications of the writer's residence in Antioch between the time of St. Paul's conversion and his first missionary journey. And if so, then we are able to trace with hardly a shadow of uncertainty the channels through which he may have obtained most of the materials of his narrative. Those that fled from Jerusalem on the persecution, must have included some of the personal disciples of Christ.[3] The fulness with which all facts connected with

[1] Acts xi. 22—30. [2] Acts xiii. 1.

[3] So when St. Paul and St. Luke go together to Jerusalem, they take with them, as able to give them a home there, one "Mnason *of Cyprus*, an old disciple" (Acts xxi. 16).

the personal history of Herod Antipas[1] are told is accounted for when we remember that one of the chief teachers at Antioch was Manaen, the foster-brother of the tetrarch; that the wife of Herod's steward had been one of the faithful women who followed our Lord through His ministrations.

But the clue thus obtained leads us, I believe, yet farther. (1.) One of the most distinctive features of the Gospel of St. Luke is the full collection of parables and narratives, belonging all of them to one and the same journey, the last journey through Peræa towards Jerusalem. In Peræa was one of the chief strongholds of Antipas.[2] If there were those in his court who were avowedly, or in heart,

[1] It may be well to bring together all the facts which lead to this conclusion. We have to note, then, that St. Luke is the only evangelist who indicates the war between Herod and Aretas by mentioning the presence of soldiers on their march among the hearers of John the Baptist (iii. 14); tells us of Herod's desire to see Jesus (ix. 7—9); names the wife of his steward as one of the company of devout women who ministered to our Lord (viii. 3), and his foster-brother as one of the prophets at Antioch (Acts xiii. 1); records the message sent to Herod by our Lord (Luke xiiii. 31—33), the quarrel between him and Pilate (xxii. 12), and its probable occasion in the massacre of Galilæan pilgrims by the latter (xiii. 1); the trial of Christ before Herod, and their consequent reconciliation (xxiii. 7—11). It is noticeable that there is a like incidental, and, as it were, unintentional prominence given, in the Acts, to facts connected with the Herodian dynasty, as in the account of the persecution of the Church by the first Herod Agrippa, his quarrel with the Tyrians and Zidonians, the intercession of Blastus, the king's sudden and strange death (xii. 1, 2, 20—23), the presence of the second Agrippa and his sister Bernice when St. Paul spoke before Festus.

[2] Machærus, where, according to Josephus ("Antiq.," xviii. 6, 2), John the Baptist had been imprisoned.

disciples of the Nazarene, this would be the teaching with which they would come most in contact, and be most anxious to preserve. (2.) Hardly less characteristic is the special fulness and the marked Hebrew stamp of his narrative of the Nativity. Whatever explanation may be given of it, the difference between the language and style of the first two chapters (after the opening prologue), and all that follows, is a problem which we have to deal with. Was he incorporating a Hebrew record with his own? and if so, where did that come from? on whose testimony did it rest? why was it preserved? What has been said suggests the answer to that question also. Friendship with Herod's foster-brother and the wife of Herod's steward would lead to some knowledge of the other members of that circle of devout women whom St. Luke names so conspicuously,[1] of the mother of James and John, of Mary of Magdala, of those sisters of Bethany whom he is the first to mention.[2] But in that group there had once been one round whom they must have gathered with the love of daughters, and all but the reverential awe of worshippers. They had known the mother of the Lord. Some of them must have lived for years in closest contact with

[1] Luke viii. 2, 3. [2] Luke x. 38—42.

her.[1] They could not fail to turn to what met every craving of their women's hearts and exalted their woman's nature. They would treasure up every record of that marvellous history which she had kept and pondered in her heart. From them, and through them, with no doubtful or deteriorating transmission, from her may have come that which we may well call the true Gospel of the Infancy.

What has been said in reference to that history when I was speaking of St. Matthew applies still more fully here. The narrative of the Nativity, if it met on the one side the exulting pride in childbirth which had all along been characteristic of the women of Israel, had on the other a special fitness for that which was pre-eminently the Gospel of the Gentiles. It at once recognized the true human joy of father and mother when a manchild is born into the world, and entered its protest against that last stage of savage or civilized depravity, when men accept the birth of a child as an evil they must submit to, mourning over the woes and troubles which are its inevitable portion.[2] How much we owe to such a

[1] Here the narrative of St. John's Gospel helps us to a fuller knowledge. In closest union with the mother of the Lord, standing with her by the cross, is Mary Magdalene (John xix. 25), the foremost figure in the group of Luke viii. 1—3.

[2] The prevalence of infanticide at the opposite extremes of the growth of

record, how much we should have lost if St. Luke had failed to write it, may be seen in the whole liturgical history of the Western Church, in the influence which it had both upon Latin and Teutonic Christianity. Christmas, with all its blameless joys, its scope for all forms of art, from that which wins the eye of a child to that which satisfies all but the highest cravings of heart and fancy,—where would this have been but for the story of the birth in Bethlehem, and of the shepherds abiding in the field, and the angels' song? Where but for that would have been the hymns—the *Magnificat*, the *Benedictus*, the *Nunc Dimittis*—which the whole Western Church has claimed as her own,[1] raising them above their first personal and historical associations, as she raises those of David or Asaph above theirs? I know not what stage in the progress of an unwilling unbelief may be attended with the sharpest pain, but I can hardly imagine any one who had once entered into this phase of the Church's life acquiescing without a

human society is significant of the predominance in each of the lowest and basest selfishness. The same characteristic appears in different forms in the account which Herodotus gives of the Trausi (v. 2), and in the *Jus trium liberorum*, by which the policy of Augustus sought to preserve the family life of Rome from utter contamination.

[1] The earliest use of the *Magnificat* is traced to Cæsarius of Arles, A.D. 506 (Bingham, *Antiq.*, xiv. 2, 7); and of the *Benedictus* to Amalarius of Metz, A.D. 820.

shudder in the thought that all its worship and its joy had their starting-point in the lying record of an apocryphal Gospel.

(4.) And yet there is a strange, marvellous contrast between the whole of that history and the opening of that fourth Gospel of which we have now to speak. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." The evangelist who, if we accept his own narrative, was most intimately connected, even as truest and most devoted son, with the mother of the Lord,[1] passes over the whole history, goes back to the thought of an eternal and Divine existence, begins what he has to tell of the human life with the work of the Baptist. Of all the many points of difference between the Gospel of St. John and that of St. Luke, which in many things comes nearest to it in tone and feeling, this is the most striking, and may well be the starting-point of our inquiries as to his relation to the other three evangelists. We shall be able, perhaps, in closing them, to see that to face a difficulty like this is the way to find the light which we need to see our way clearly there and elsewhere.

I assume, hypothetically, with the boldest and latest criticism—with Renan and with Ewald,[2]—the author-

[1] John xix. 26, 27.

[2] See references in p. 42.

ship of St. John's Gospel. The notion that such a book could be the fruit either of the weak and corrupt Gnosticism of the second century, or of the struggle of the Church against that Gnosticism, may now be relegated to the limbo where phantasies and unrealities jostle against each other, like figures in a sick man's dream. But being written by the son of Zebedee, the questions in what relation it stands to the personal character of that apostle, and to the other three Gospels, are beyond all doubt of the profoundest interest. They have been felt to be so ever since the time that the four narratives were in the hands of Christendom; and men have employed themselves with more or less success, according to their knowledge or their insight, in guessing at the answer. It was a supplement to the others, written by one who knew them. It was a protest against docetic heresies that denied the true humanity of Christ, or against the mere humanitarianism of other false teachers. It differs in thought and language from them, either, as some have said, because the evangelist interwove with the teaching of his Master the ideas on which his own mind was perpetually feeding, or because there was in him a receptivity for a higher form of truth than the other disciples could apprehend, or because the doctrine which pervades

both his Gospel and Epistles was, either at the time when it was first proclaimed or afterwards, esoteric in its character—confined to the chosen few to whom it was given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God.[1]

With this, as with the other Gospels, it is at least a legitimate beginning to start from the personal history of the man, and see what light that throws upon the book.[2] (1.) There are distinct indications of some kind of connection between the evangelist and the Jewish priesthood: "That disciple was known unto the high priest."[3] He bears what at this period was predominantly a priestly name, and that name must have been given to him within a few years or months after it had been solemnly bestowed on the infant Baptist.[4] The fact that the

[1] In a work like the present it does not seem necessary to name and classify those who have maintained one or other of these views. The supporters of each may be reckoned by the score; and, for my present purpose, it is enough to name them thus generally as the hypotheses out of which the student of the Gospel history has to elect or to refuse, according as they commend themselves to his judgment.

[2] See the article "John the Apostle" in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible.*

[3] John xviii. 15.

[4] So we find another John among the kindred of Caiaphas (Acts iv. 6), and both in Josephus and the Books of Maccabees meet with other examples. John, surnamed Mark, was probably, as we have seen, a Levite, and the Hebrew form of the name, Johanan, meets us in the list of high priests in 1 Chron. vi. 10, and in that of the priestly families who returned with Ezra (Ezra viii. 12; Neh. xii. 13, 42). The later popularity of the name is traceable to the love of the people for John Hyrcanus. The connection of the sons of

imagery of the Apocalypse is throughout sacerdotal and liturgical, drawn from the temple services, leads to the belief that those services must have been familiar to him in his early manhood, and left on his mind an impression never afterwards to be effaced.[1] Even the tradition which speaks of his wearing upon his brow the golden plate of the high priest, whatever may have been its starting-point, or whatever may be its explanation,[2] bears witness that he was thought of in the minds of the Church of the second century as being more closely associated than were the other apostles with the idea of the priesthood. It might well be that a disciple so

Zebedee with the priesthood has been maintained by Ewald (*Christus*, p. 177). In Josephus (B. 7, iv. 4) the two names James and John occur as belonging to two brothers.

[1] Thus we have the seven golden candlesticks (Rev. i. 13), the Son of Man seen in a priestly dress (i. 13), references to the manna which had been kept in the sanctuary, and probably also in the "white stone" to the Urim and Thummim (ii. 17), the cherubic forms of the "living creatures," as in Ezekiel's vision (iv. 7), elders with harps and censers (v. 8), the angel standing by the altar and offering incense (viii. 3, 4), another angel bidding him measure the temple and its courts (xi. 1, 2).

[2] Strange as the story is, I cannot bring myself to reject it as altogether incredible. It is related on testimony sufficiently early to give it the character a fairly authentic tradition (Polycrates in Euseb., H. E., iii. 31, v. 24), and to a of mind living in the symbolism of the Apocalypse this might appear no unfit token that the glory of the Aaronic priesthood had passed away, that he and others were made "kings and priests" (Rev. i. 6; v. 10), had the "new name written on their foreheads" (Rev. xiv. 1), and had the "white stone" of the Urim and Thummim (Rev. ii. 17). Ewald's conjecture (*l. c.*), that he adopted it as inferring from Deut. xxxiii. 8 the extension of the pontifical insignia to all *Levites*, has far less in its favour.

trained would be, more even than Peter, foremost and nearest to his Master's side in the visits to Jerusalem,[1] would dwell with special fulness on the teaching of which the temple was the scene, even as he is able to report what the other evangelists do not mention; what passed in the secret deliberations of the priests;[2] Nicodemus's visit by night;[3] his protest against hasty condemnation; Caiaphas's counsel.[4] If such a man in his old age found the Church in possession of a full store of knowledge as to the Galilæan ministry of Christ, we cannot wonder that he should bring out of his treasury that which was wanted to complete it, without which the Church would have had but a part only of his

[1] Among many striking features of the narratives of our Lord's ministry at Jerusalem, one of the most so is the entire silence of the disciples while He is teaching or disputing with the Pharisees and priests. To Galilæan peasants this, of course, was natural enough, but it throws light on the difference between their relative positions which might be caused by the journey to the Holy City. Among the Galilæan multitudes the bold, impetuous Peter was naturally the most prominent disciple, and is conspicuous for questions and reproofs that almost startle us by their *naïveté* and boldness. But it might well be that the disciple who was nearest to His side at Jerusalem would be the one who was of highest culture, and was allied, by some tie of intimacy or relationship, with the priesthood. I can hardly bring myself to discuss M. Renan's view that St. John's purpose was systematically to depreciate St. Peter and exalt himself (*Vie de Jésus*, p. xxvii.). I do not speak of the incapacity which it shows for even the most superficial estimate of the character of the "beloved disciple," but it is surely flagrantly at variance with the prominence which he gives to St. Peter's confession in vi. 68, 69, and to the special trust committed to him in xxi. 15—18.

[2] John vii. 32; ix. 22; xi. 47. [3] John iii. 1; vii. 50. [4] John xi. 49, 50.

Master's teaching. Whatever objections there may be—and they are, I believe, altogether insuperable—to the theory that his Gospel is supplementary to the other three, as books known to him and read by him,[1]—there are few or none to the conclusion that a widely diffused knowledge of the Galilæan ministry and the more popular teaching of Christ was diffused among the Asiatic churches when he wrote. (2.) What has been said implies that there was a distinction of some kind between that popular teaching and this which St. John has placed on record. We must not let the word "esoteric," with all its associations of a false mystery and a pretended wisdom, deter us from acknowledging the fact that there were gradations of this nature in our Lord's teaching. To the multitude of eager listeners He set forth, as in the Sermon on the Mount, the laws of His kingdom. When men grew hard in their resistance to the truth, then to those who were without all these things were done in parables, which He explained privately to His disciples.[2] He was training them, though after another fashion than that of the schools

[1] It is surely enough to refer to the perplexing difference between his narrative and that of the other three Gospels as to the day and hour of the Crucifixion. Whatever explanation may be given, it is all but incredible that he should, either unconsciously or deliberately, have left these difficulties unexplained, if he had the other records before him.

[2] Matt. xiii. 11; Mark iv. 33, 34.

of Jerusalem, to be the scribes and rabbis of His kingdom.[1] And yet even with them the work was slow and far from easy. He had many things to say which they could not as yet bear.[2] The deeper teaching repelled many whom the earlier had attracted. Those who were not repelled were yet incapable of receiving it in its fulness.[3] It was not surprising that all the earlier memoirs or compilations should reproduce only or chiefly what had proved itself to be more acceptable and intelligible. Even here, however, there are glimpses of a higher teaching. Words are recorded by St. Matthew and St. Luke which sound like echoes of what we find chiefly in St. John.[4] But the fact that the latter records all but exclusively the teaching of which Jerusalem was the scene, affords (over and above whatever was peculiar to his own character) an explanation of this difference. It was one thing to teach the multitudes of Galilee, or the provincial Pharisees in synagogues, with no other religion than that of forms, traditions, ritual, and quite another to speak to those who were the "masters of Israel," and, as such, had at least come into contact with what might have helped them to under-

[1] Matt. xiii. 52. [2] John xvi. 12. [3] John vi. 60.
[4] Matt. xi. 25—27; Luke x. 21, 22.

stand a higher truth. Such men knew, in word or phrase at least, of an Eternal Spirit dwelling with men, of a Light that lighteth every man, of a new birth accompanying the baptism of every proselyte from heathenism, of a Messiah who should be at once Son of God and Son of Man.[1] What hindered them from accepting the truth in its fulness was that they could not without a struggle bring themselves to own that they too needed a new birth, or to identify the Christ, the Son of God, with one whom they thought of as the carpenter's son of Nazareth. But it was natural, one might almost say inevitable, that He who claimed that title should, in His dealing with them, treat them as capable at least of apprehending that knowledge which their pride led them to reject. The question, "Art Thou

[1] Compare Schoettgen's *Hor. Hebr.*, Lightfoot's *Hor. Hebr.*, and Nork's *Rabbinische Quellen und Parallelen*, in all that touches on this Gospel. Some of their quotations will meet the reader farther on in the notes to Lect. IV. Such passages are, of course, of later date, but comparing them with the language of the Book of Wisdom (vii. 22—30), and Ecclesiasticus (i. 17), there seems every reason for referring them to an earlier pre-Christian tradition. I am bound to add that, while there are many of Mr. Ernest De Bunsen's conclusions which I am unable to adopt, he appears to me (*Hidden Wisdom of Christ*, c. ii.) to have shown clearly the existence of a secret line of traditional teaching of this kind, as distinct from popular Pharisaism, and to have connected it with the influence of an Aryan element. His attempt to restore the word "apocryphal" to its true meaning will hardly, I fear, be successful, and, unless it be so, it tends to mislead his hearers. Men are startled at hearing our Lord and St. Paul described as the "preachers of an apocryphal doctrine," in spite of the use of that word by the Apostle himself in Col. ii. 3.

the Master of Israel, and knowest not these things?" gives the key to the teaching. (3.) I cannot conceal my conviction that there are signs in the history of the mother Church of Jerusalem, partly of a slow progress upwards to wider thoughts and truths, partly of reticence and reserve. The case of Cornelius showed how far the freedom of the Gospel was from being at first fully apprehended;[1] the synod or council at Jerusalem how slowly it was received and acted on.[2] It was a "mystery," in St. Paul's language, revealed specially to "prophets and apostles by the Spirit."[3] When he went up to make known at Jerusalem the Gospel which he preached without reserve among the Gentiles, it was "privately to them of reputation," to Peter, James, John, who "seemed to be pillars."[4] The very fact that, except at the hands of the Sadducees, there was no persecution before the preaching of Stephen, that after that persecution the Church lived on in comparative tranquillity, that thousands of Pharisees and "zealots for the law" were numbered among its members,[5] that they were allowed to worship in the temple, and to hold their own meetings there,[6] show clearly that they could not have brought into dis-

[1] Acts xi. 2, 3. [2] Acts xv. 1—6. [3] Ephes. iii. 5.
[4] Gal. ii. 2, 9. [5] Acts xxi. 20. [6] Acts v. 12.

tinct prominence what would have roused the hatred of the Jews as blasphemy, as it had done when it came from their Master's lips, or from St. Stephen's or St. Paul's.[1]

As there were reasons, personal it may be, which prevented the record of the raising of Lazarus from being made known till he himself had died or had left Jerusalem,[2] so as long as the apostle remained there, in filial consecration of his life to the care of his Lord's mother, the records that were current in the churches of Palestine were probably in harmony with that reserve, and are represented by what reflects directly and indirectly the teaching of the Apostles of the Circumcision, modified in the case of St. Luke by his association with St. Paul and with the prophets of Antioch, and in that of St. Mark by his fellowship with both St. Peter and St. Paul, the substance, *i. e.*, of the first three Gospels. But when the changes and chances of his life carried the fisherman of Bethsaida to the Asiatic churches, he found the way prepared for him by the labours of the Apostle of the Gentiles. The Gospel, communicated at Jerusalem "privately" and to a few,

[1] Here also I may refer to Mr. De Bunsen's work as having contributed some suggestive hints (*Hidden Wisdom*, c. xii. and xiii.).

[2] For a fuller discussion of the questions connected with this history, I refer the reader to the article "Lazarus" in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible.*

had been preached in its fulness to those to whom that apostle had not shrunk (manifestly contrasting himself with other teachers who did shrink) from "proclaiming the whole counsel of God;"[1] to whom he had spoken of the blood shed upon the cross as the blood of God;[2] who had heard, in the utterances of prophets or the outlines of a creed, that God, or Christ as the Son of God, had been manifested in the flesh;[3] that in Him dwelt the fulness of the Godhead bodily.[4] Side by side with this preparation for the truth there were strange caricatures and denials of it. Some denied that the Christ had come in the flesh,[5] others that Jesus was the Christ,[6] or that He was indeed the Son of God,[7] or that they had any

[1] Acts xx. 27.

[2] Acts xx. 28. I do not insist on this reading, but it has the support of Cod. B, the Vulgate and Peschito Versions, and, last but not least, of the Sinaitic MS.

[3] 1 Tim. iii. 16. As a question of textual criticism, it is impossible, I believe, to accept Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη as the right reading. But the only alternative reading of any authority compels us to look for the antecedent of the relative ("*who* was manifested") either to the "living God" of the preceding verse, or to some word, like Christ, or the Son of God, or the *Logos*, in the creed which the apostle quotes. To take the "mystery" as itself identical with the person who was so manifested, has no support from St. Paul's language elsewhere. To look upon it as a truth which had been kept secret, and which others were wishing to keep so, but which he, the apostle, was eager to proclaim, is in entire harmony with it. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 51; Ephes. i. 9; iii. 3—5, 9; v. 32; Col. i. 26; ii. 2.

[4] Col. i. 19. For a fuller treatment of the question, see Note F, on the Connexion between the Asiatic Epistles of St. Paul, and the Gospel according to St. John.

[5] 1 John iv. 3. [6] 1 John ii. 22. [7] 1 John iv. 15.

fellowship with Him, and through Him with the Father. For them the Christ was a Jewish teacher only, or all true personality was lost in dreams and words. Here, then, was that which called for something more than the Church already had—for the witness, which none could bear so well as the disciple whom Jesus loved, to the reality of his Lord's human nature, His affection, His weariness, His tears—to what had been His own teaching as to Himself and His relation to His Father, when that teaching reached its highest point and revealed the full glory of the truth. (4.) It might seem at first that the tie of a Divine adoption, which brought together St. John and the mother of the Lord, would have led him to give with a rich and overflowing fulness a record of the facts of the Nativity, instead of leaving it in as profound silence. Yet the very omission is, I believe, significant and instructive. The record of all that Christians needed as to that history was current already in the Church. In the very depths of his sympathy and reverence for the Virgin mother, his spirit would grow like hers who "kept all these things, and pondered them in her heart."[1] He, too, might feel by an intuitive perception of what has been brought out by the experience of later ages, that the

[1] Luke ii. 19, 51.

history of the Nativity, true in itself, and ministering to the joy and edification of those who dwell on it with believing and loving hearts, is yet less fitted than that of the manhood of Christ to be the remedy for denial and doubt. Minds that dwell too exclusively on the former have tended to fall into a state of feeling half feminine or half infantile, playing with the circumstance and show of the Divine birth, unable to rise beyond the thought of the Child in the mother's arms, practically led to think of the relationship between the Madonna and the Infant as the permanent relationship which is to govern their worship and their life. A Church in which that history occupies in men's minds a position out of proportion to that which is assigned to it in the Gospel record, is on its way to Mariolatry. And so here, also, with an anticipation, conscious or unconscious, of the dangers of a time to come, like that which has been imagined by one of the greatest among living poets,[1] St. John, leaving others to give the "pure milk" which was needed for the life of spiritual childhood, himself supplies the "strong meat," the solid food of thought, meeting the wants of those who are of full age, the cravings of man's heart and reason. If he names the mother of the Lord, whom

[1] Browning's "A Death in the Desert," in his *Dramatis Personæ*.

he had known so well, it is to indicate in what entire independence of her control and guidance He had manifested His kingdom,[1] not as exalted to a throne left vacant in the heavens, a title wonderful and majestic, but as a mother lonely and bereaved, needing the protection which it had been his duty and his joy to give.[2]

V. From these four witnesses, then, we have to learn who and what He was whose life, death, resurrection, were the starting-point of Christendom. Men may have dwelt with a natural delight in past ages on all imagery and play of fancy that seemed to set forth their unity and diversity. They were as the four rivers that watered the paradise of God—the four mysterious forms that made up the likeness of the cherubim. For us their claim to reverence lies in the fact that they are the chosen witnesses—chosen by the divine Will working through the agency of time, by the "fire" which "tries every man's work of what sort it is,"[3] the "few chosen" out of "many" who were "called" to a like work,—witnesses of the story of that Life which, as a human life, has nothing co-

[1] John ii. 4.

[2] John xix. 27. I cannot hold, with Dr. Newman (*Letter to Dr. Pusey*), that he who had watched her failing strength to the end saw her afterwards in vision as "a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet" (Rev. xii. 1).

[3] 1 Cor. iii. 13.

ordinate with it in the history of the world, though, because it was human, there may be a thousand parallels, in which we have learned to see, and believe that we shall see more clearly, the more closely we gaze on it, "the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of His person."[1]

[1] Heb. i. 3.

III.

THE TRAINING OF THE KING.

III.

THE TRAINING OF THE KING.

WHAT I have already said will in part explain why I do not purpose at this stage to enter fully on the history of the Nativity. Whatever that history may contribute to the joy of Christendom, whatever power it may have to kindle the love of believing souls, we cannot ignore the fact that in the controversy with unbelief, in the inquiry of doubting and distracted spirits, it repels rather than attracts. It has to be seen in the light which the Life reflects on it; the Life has to be apprehended in all its infinite perfection, before the man who in heart or intellect is outside the Church's faith can heartily embrace it. In following this order now we are but accepting the guidance of the process by which that faith was

strengthened and developed. To but a few only was the secret mystery revealed. The Life was manifested, the works bore their witness, the teaching sank deep into men's minds, and the death drew all men's hearts, and then, when they had learnt to confess that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God, they were led to see that this was the true, divinely necessary beginning of the Life.

I do not shrink, at fitting time and in fitting place, from the contest which those whose spirit has not been that of honest and reverential doubt, but of bitter and sharp antagonism, have chosen to invite on this as their favourite battle-field. Here I can only note how, step by step, the difficulties which at one time seemed so formidable, have, through the labours of later scholars, all but disappeared. They needed not the faith that removes mountains, but only the clear sight and the patient surveys which ascertain that the mountains are but molehills. The difference between the genealogies of St. Matthew and St. Luke, the massacre of the babes at Bethlehem, the census of the Empire, the taxing which was "first made when Cyrenius was Governor of Syria," the meaning of the central word in the great prophecy of Isaiah,—these may now fairly be regarded as points which have become stronger and not weaker in proportion to the

advance of criticism. What has been suggested as to the sources from which St. Matthew and St. Luke derived their narratives, may lead the doubter at least to suspend his judgment on that which may still seem wonderful and startling.[1]

I start, then, not with the beginning, but with the unfolding of the human life of Christ. I seek to keep ever in remembrance myself, what has been, from the first, the faith of Christendom as to that birth and that life. I wish those who have learnt to live in that faith, and find it their hope and stay, to turn aside from any words of mine that may be inconsistent with it. But in order that we may learn the lesson which the life of the Son of Man is meant to teach us, our thoughts of the great mystery of godliness should be as were the thoughts of the apostles and prophets through whom the Church received it, as were those of the great teachers of the Church who have borne their witness of it, not such as have first mingled with and then been substituted for them. What was once rejected as a heresy has since crept in among us and been all but recognized as a dogma. We think of the divine Eternal Word as simply tenanting a human body; or, if of the human "reasonable soul" as still subsisting, then of that as possessing all Divine

[1] See Note G, on the History of the Infancy of Christ.

attributes, conscious from the very first of that mysterious union, possessing and manifesting from the very first all treasures of wisdom and of knowledge. We are slow to apprehend the truth that that soul passed, in its growth of intellect and feeling, through the same stages as our own; that knowledge came to it, as it comes to us, through sacred books, or human teaching, or the influence of surrounding circumstances,—widening more and more with the advancing years,—led on, in the fulness of time, into all truth by the Spirit which was given to Him, "not by measure," and "abode upon Him." We elaborately explain away the words which tell us that this growth of mind was as real as the growth of body; that He "increased in wisdom as in stature."[1] We think of Him from the first, even in childhood, as teaching, not as learning. Assuming the energy in Him of all Divine attributes, we pass over the conflict of human emotions, without which there could be no experience, no discipline, no temptation, no sympathy. We cannot bring ourselves, in spite of the plainest statements in the Gospel record, to think of Him as gaining knowledge of any kind from those around Him;[2] wondering with the surprise of those whose hopes are bitterly dis-

[1] Luke ii. 52. [2] Mark ix. 21.

appointed ;[1] looking into the future as with a partial insight, as knowing not the day or the hour of the full completion of His work ;[2] praying, "*If it be possible*, remove this cup from Me ;"[3] submitting His will to the will of His Father. And yet the whole beauty and significance of the Life, as sinless, perfect, archetypal, melts away in proportion as we substitute this, the error of Apollinarius,[4] for the Church's faith. Instead of a true Son of Man, perfected by suffering,[5]—passing, *i. e.*, through experience, to His full maturity, learning by that suffering the full meaning of obedience,[6]—we fashion for ourselves the thought of a simulated humanity, a childhood almighty and all-knowing, with the appearance but not the reality of growth in power and in wisdom.

It may seem to some that these thoughts lead us on to a mere humanitarianism, and destroy the truth of the Incarnation on its Divine side more fatally even than the conception of which I have spoken destroys the reality of the human. How are we to think of that indivisible union of the Godhead and the manhood—that contact of the reasonable soul and the Eternal Word,—without extending to the lower the wisdom, power, perfection of the higher ?

[1] Mark vi. 6. [2] Mark xiii. 32. [3] Matt. xxvi. 39.
[4] See Note H, on the Influence of Apollinarianism on Modern Theology.
[5] Heb. ii. 10. [6] Heb. v. 8.

If there was not at all times the consciousness of that Divine perfection, how can we think of the Divine Nature as actually at all times present? I do not dream that the answer to that question can be ever given fully.[1] It is, in an indefinitely higher degree, as incapable of being formulated with logical completeness as are the answers to all questions as to *any* contact, communion, fellowship, reciprocal action, between the Divine and the human. What approximations to an answer are possible must be derived, not only or chiefly from human speculations, but from the teaching of the Inspired Word. And here the lines of thought which are opened to us are twofold. 1. In the one central passage which, more even than the prologue of St. John's Gospel or the teaching of St. John's Epistles, has been the standard of the Church's faith, the truth of the Incarnation is expressed by a word which our English version has robbed of more than half its significance. After the precept, "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus," St. Paul adds, in words which come nearest of any scriptural statement to the fulness of the Nicene Creed, "who, being" (in His own very nature) "in the form of God,

[1] Since these Lectures were delivered, the question has been handled in a thoughtful and reverential manner by the Rev. James Moorhouse, in his Hulsean Lectures on "Our Lord Jesus, the Subject of Growth of Wisdom."

did not count equality with God a *thing to be seized on as a prey*, but *emptied* Himself, taking the form of a servant, coming to be in the likeness of a man."[1] This speaks of the wonder which St. John describes yet more briefly, "The Word became flesh, and dwelt among us."[2] What follows describes the growth of the human life to its completeness, its exaltation to the glory which the Divine Word had had in His eternal oneness with the Father: "Being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, becoming obedient[3] *up to the point of death*, even the death of the cross." In that word, "emptied Himself," we may find what at least serves to interpret both the language and the facts of the Gospel history. Unless we altogether sensualize our thoughts of the glory of the heaven of heavens, and transfer to the majesty of God the imagery borrowed from that of earthly kings, that form of God, that glory of the Father, can

[1] I refer the reader who wishes to see this interpretation of Phil. ii. 6, 7 discussed and maintained with the elaborate accuracy which characterizes all his work as an interpreter, to Bishop Ellicott's Commentary, *in loc.* The passages cited by Waterland (*Works*, ii., pp. 95—99), though he defends the Authorized Version, show not only, as Bishop Ellicott says, that this interpretation is "sound and catholic," but that there is (with the exception of Tertullian) a *consensus* of the Ante-Nicene Church in its favour.

[2] John i. 14.

[3] It is well to note the identity of thought with Heb. v. 8. In both stress is laid upon the truth that the central idea of the death of Christ was that it came as the crown and consummation of a life of perfect obedience to the Father's will.

be conceived of only as the possession, energy, activity of the Divine attributes. To "empty Himself" of these was to submit to the conditions not of an infinite but a finite life; to become "lower than the angels,"[1] even as the sons of men are lower, that He might rise through successive stages to a height far above all principalities and powers, to the Name which is above every name, the glory which He had with the Father before the world was.[2] Without that submission, so far as our powers of thought can carry us, men could not have learnt to believe in the perfect sympathy to which we now can trust, as rising out of a real experience. Whatever difficulties may in some minds gather round the thought of the Divine Word, the "Light that lighteth every man," gaining any new insight into man's nature, or fresh power to sympathize, we can but reason upward from the known to the unknown, and believe, that as one who has all but the widest knowledge of mankind may yet find that knowledge gain altogether a new character by actually sharing, though it were

[1] Heb. ii. 9.

[2] Phil. ii. 9; Ephes. i. 21; John xvii. 5. No rendering could be better for the word in question than the "se ipsum exinanivit" of the Vulgate, nor any comment better than Bengel's "Celavit . . . homines et angelos, imo etiam se ipsum: adeoque non solum celavit, sed etiam abnegavit et abstinuit." He compares it with a king's abdication, not only of kingly pomp and state, but of power and sovereignty.

but for a single night, their poverty and shame, so, over and above the witness which the human life of Christ gave of the sympathy of God, there may have been, through the mystery of the Incarnation, an actual expansion of the perfection of the Divine glory, even as each creative act must be thought of as a development of that eternal Majesty which existed when as yet the worlds were not. Such, at least, is the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and it finds an echo in the hearts of all who read the Gospel history. The Eternal Son "learned obedience." Because He has been tempted He is able to sympathize. We trust in the Incarnate Son more than in the Divine Omniscience as an attribute, because the Incarnation has made us surer than we could have been without it, that He knows and pities our infirmities.[1]

2. The teaching of Scripture as to the lower instances in which the Divine and human, the infinite and the finite, are brought into fellowship with each other, may lead us upward to truer thoughts of the highest. If we, too, are made "partakers of the Divine nature,"[2]—if Christ dwelleth in us, He in us

[1] Heb. ii. 17, 18; iv. 15; v. 8.

[2] 2 Pet. i. 4. It is obvious that this throws light upon the meaning of the corresponding words, "fellowship" and "communion," in 2 Cor. xiii. 14; Ephes. iii. 9; 1 John i. 3, and the language of the New Testament generally.

and we in Him,[1] we one with Him as He is one with the Father,[2]—if, as in Him dwelt the fulness of the Godhead bodily, His people also are through Him filled with all the fulness of Christ,[3]—if our bodies, too, are temples, as His was, of the living God, through the indwelling of the Eternal Spirit,[4]—if, as has been said, the spiritual life of every member of Christ, the life of the Church in its completeness, are "extensions of the Incarnation,"[5] then the law by which the two co-exist in us (eliminating the one element of the sinfulness which is in us and was not in Him[6]) may be thought of as at least analogous to that by which they co-existed in Him. As we pass through stages in each of which the Divine life manifests itself more fully not only to the eyes of others, but to our own consciousness, our knowledge becoming clearer, our fellowship with the Father more perfect, our spiritual childhood passing into manhood, and mortality into life, till we too

[1] Ephes. iii. 17; Col. i. 27. [2] John xvii. 21.

[3] Col. i. 19; ii. 9; Ephes. iv. 13; John i. 16. [4] John ii. 21; 1 Cor. vi. 19.

[5] The phrase, first used by Jeremy Taylor, was revived and popularized by the late Robert Wilberforce in his *Treatise on the Incarnation* (c. xiii). The thought, however, pervades the language of the New Testament and of Catholic theology from the first, not indeed without its corruptions, both on the sacramental and mystical sides, but also as the source of strength, life, hope, to countless thousands.

The application of this analogy is surely suggested as a right exercise of reverential thought by the language of the Epistle to the Hebrews (ii. 14—18; iv. 15; v. 7—9).

shall know even as also we are known ;[1] so we may think of like stages in the unfolding, to and through His human nature, of that Divine perfection which in itself is incapable of change or of degree, with which there "is no variableness, neither shadow of turning."[2]

We are able, then, I will not say to represent to ourselves with any completeness, but at least to note the circumstances and stages of that life in the home at Nazareth. There, in that obscure Galilæan village, poor even below the poverty of their neighbours, were the husband and the wife ; the one working for his daily bread at such carpentering as was needed for the village houses, or the village synagogue, the other brooding in her heart over her hopes and fears for the future : each with a reticent consciousness of the greatness of the Life committed to their charge ; each, at times, half losing count of the true measure of that greatness, in the familiarity of daily intercourse. There (whatever explanation we give of the perplexing name) were the brethren and the sisters of the Lord, James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas, growing up without the knowledge which showed itself in the reverence of the Virgin Mother, older most probably than

[1] 1 Cor. xiii. 12 ; 1 John iii. 2. [2] Jas. i. 17.

He, looking on Him with wonder and amazement; standing to Him in much the same relation that the elder brothers of David did to him,[1] one of them destined afterwards to reproduce, with a faithful and loving exactness, one phase at least of the life and teaching which he had at last learnt to look upon as Divine. And for all alike, there would be the instruction which was common in the families of devout Israelites. They, like Timotheus, would learn to "know the Holy Scriptures daily;"[2] would repeat the creed which every Jew regarded as his greatest treasure;[3] would learn the well-known texts (the Tephillin) which were to be worn as signs upon their arms, and frontlets between their eyes.[4] Side by side with that culture there would be the training in the craft at which Joseph worked. What-

[1] Compare the half-sneering tone, in the one case of 1 Sam. xvii. 28, and in the other of John vii. 3, 4.

[2] 2 Tim. iii. 15.

[3] The *Shema*, so called from the first Hebrew word of the confession of faith of Deut. vi. 4.

[4] These, identical with the phylacteries of Matt. xxiii. 5, were taken from Exod. xiii. 2—10, 11—17; Deut. vi. 4—9, 13—22. If we might reason from the wide-spread use of Greek in the common speech of Palestine, and the large number of Hellenistic Jews to be found everywhere, we might think of that language as also known and spoken in the Galilæan towns, and of the books which are only found in the Greek version of the Old Testament Scriptures as being at least accessible. The Epistle of the brother of the Lord presents unmistakeable references to the Wisdom of Solomon and Ecclesiasticus. Comp. Jas. i. 11, 12 with Wisd. ii. 8; v. 16, and Jas. i. 6, 8, 25, with Ecclus. vii. 10; i. 28; xiv. 23.

ever hopes a Jewish parent might cherish of his child's future, as a rabbi or a prophet, the discipline of manual labour was never omitted.[1] In times of sudden chances and changes, no one could tell what he might need in the uncertain future; and with the best and noblest minds it had passed into a maxim, that the work of a teacher was to be undertaken for its own sake, and not as a means of livelihood.[2] So the twelve years passed, a true human life developing according to the laws of its own perfection, and the Child grew, and "waxed strong in spirit,"[3]—as did the child of Zacharias and Elisabeth,—even in that childhood giving proof of strength of will to resist all evil, and steadfastness in all good, free from the sins and selfishness of childhood, as afterwards He was to be free from the sins of manhood; "filled with wisdom," according to the measure of fulness that belonged to the capacity of His age. And "the grace of God was upon Him;" on Him was stamped visibly the witness of the Divine favour, given freely, in proportion as each gift was accepted and

[1] So our Lord is spoken of, not only as the "carpenter's son," Matt. xiii. 55, but as Himself "the carpenter," Mark vi. 3. Justin (*c. Tryph.*, c. 88) reports that ploughs and yokes were shown as having been made by Him.

[2] *Pirke Aboth.*, ii. 2, "All knowledge which is not united with labour, tends to nothingness and occasions sin." Hillel worked for his livelihood. Comp. art. "Scribes" in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible.*

[3] Luke i. 80; ii. 40.

incorporated with the life. The human life, untainted as it was with evil, was yet dependent upon that favour as the condition of its growing to completeness.

Then came the one incident recorded of the thirty years of preparation,—recorded manifestly as having in it a half prophetic character; treasured up in the memory of the mother as being the first token of the coming fulfilment of the promises that had preceded and accompanied His birth.[1] At or about the age of twelve, each Jewish boy entered upon a new stage of his life. He was examined in his creed, and his knowledge of the sacred books, and became a "child of the precept," bound to a man's observance of the law.[2] In this instance, the special gifts and graces, which were so conspicuous, may have led to a slight anticipation of the usual period. In proportion to those gifts and graces would the new

[1] Luke ii. 51.

[2] The fact is mentioned in all commentaries. It may be well to quote the words on which the statement rests:—"Up to the age of thirteen a father has to care for his son's fulfilment of the duties of religion. But on his thirteenth birthday he may say, Blessed be He who has made me free from the burden of my son's sins" (*Bereschith Rabba*, fol. 64). After the age of twelve, it is a boy's duty to observe the day of Atonement (*Joma*, fol. 82). The quotations are taken from Nork, *Rabbin. Quell. und Parall.* Compare Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.*, on Luke ii. The quotations given in the *Pirke Aboth.* (v. 24) are curious enough. At five, a boy might read the Scriptures; at ten, the Mishna; at thirteen, he had to observe the "precepts;" at fifteen, he might read the Talmud.

experience of a pilgrimage to the Holy City bring with it thoughts and feelings to which the life of Nazareth had been a stranger. If associations of the past, the sanctity of holy places, eager thirst for the highest and noblest wisdom,—if these enter into the formation of human characters, in almost exact proportion to the extent of their victory over evil, and their likeness to the life of Christ, we cannot dare to think of them as absent from that Life which was archetypal in its completeness.

So, at all events, it was. For Him the seven days of the Paschal feast were not enough. The thought which had filled the heart of the Psalmist, that "one day in those courts was better than a thousand,"[1] filled His. The zeal for that house, which afterwards consumed Him,[2] began to burn then. Here, from the scribes who sat in Moses' seat, there might be the unfolding of the true meaning of the law of Moses and the history of Israel. There, if we suppose the scene to have been a meeting of the Academy of Scribes, sitting, as was their wont, to answer questions put by disciples or inquiring strangers, may have been those who were then prominent as the representatives of the two rival schools of Pharisaism, possibly even the

[1] Psa. lxxxiv. 10. [2] John ii. 17.

heads of those schools themselves—Hillel and Shammai; Simeon, the son of Hillel; Jonathan, the translator of the sacred books into the common language,[1] who, in that very work of translating, had thrown light upon some of their dark places; perhaps also, those who were afterwards to come into contact with the new truths, Gamaliel and Nicodemus. For three days — so the history clearly implies, already acting on the law which He afterwards proclaimed, that there are cases in which the absorbing power of the higher life suspends for a time the relations and duties of the lower,—the young face, hitherto unknown, was seen within the circle of listeners, soon within that of questioners. The presence of such a listener was the joy of a true Rabbi's heart.[2] If Hillel himself were there, it may have brought back to his memory the eager thirst for knowledge of which Jewish legends have preserved so striking a tradition.[3] Not as a disputant or a teacher,

[1] The probability of the presence of some or all of these at the scene which St. Luke narrates is suggested and maintained by Bishop Ellicott in his *Hulsean Lectures*, p. 92.

[2] Compare the touching language of one of them: "I have learnt much from the Rabbis my teachers; I have learnt more from the Rabbis my colleagues; I have learnt most of all from my disciples" (Carpzov., *App. Crit.*, i. 7).

[3] Hillel, it was said, unable to pay the fee for admission to the class-room which was required under the *régime* of Herod, had come to listen to Abtalion and Shemaiah, and stood aside, though it was winter, till the window was darkened by the snow which rested on his shoulders. See Geiger, "De Hillele," in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, xxi., and article "Scribes" *ut supra.*

—with no precocity of manifested knowledge, but as one who came to learn the truth of God, and would be satisfied with nothing less,—as one whose perception of the truth was clear with the clearness of an untainted purity, filled with a wisdom from above, and therefore, even in the earlier stages of its development, rising into a higher region than those who lived only in the traditions of the elders,—He sat in the midst of them, asking and answering questions, not yet, of course, as one of them, but still less as on the level of other children of the same age, and the oldest and the gravest were forced by those questions to look within,—as old and grave men may be constrained now by the questions of a child,—to compare traditions with the letter of the law, the letter with the true spirit.[1] And with this there came, as the record clearly shows, the first recorded utterance that spoke of consciousness of a higher life. "Why should Joseph and His mother have sought Him so sorrowfully? Might they not have known that no childish caprice, no love of the stir and splendour of the city, would have kept Him from them—nothing but the conviction that He had a Father in heaven, whose claim on His life was higher than that of any earthly parent, and that He

[1] So Josephus relates (*Vit.*, c. 2) that the chief priests and chief men of the city used to come and hear his boyish answers concerning questions of the Law, when he was but fourteen.

must now live in what that Father called Him to, in His house, occupied with His work."[1]

The fact of an awakening of this kind in that pattern life, so analogous to what has often been recorded of the lives that are most after its likeness, is itself significant. The fact that it is the only incident of the kind recorded is even more so. As one who became obedient to the law, there must have been for Him now the visit, at least once every year, to the Holy City,—possibly, as during the time of His ministry, even more frequently. Whatever reverence and zeal for the house of God showed itself afterwards was manifested, we must believe, continually. But of visits to the schools of Jerusalem there is not even a trace. He sits at the feet of no Gamaliel. When He appeared afterwards as a teacher, the astonishment of those who listened to Him uttered itself in the words, "How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?"[2] "Whence this knowledge of divine wisdom in one whom no Rabbi has numbered among his disciples?" Changes passed over that school at Jerusalem. The older teachers fell asleep. Men like Nicodemus and Gamaliel rose to take their place.

[1] While the τὰ τοῦ Πατρός of Luke ii. 49 is probably of wider range than the mere building, the rendering, "in my Father's business," excludes the local application too entirely.

[2] John vii. 15.

The contending parties strove for the mastery. Sadducees, under the patronage of the higher members of the priesthood, grew in influence.[1] But the changes were nothing to Him, save that He saw evermore how far all the sects and schools were from the truth of His Father's kingdom, how rapidly the literalism of the Sadducees was sinking into gross ignorance, how far even the best of the Pharisees were from realizing the truths which they acknowledged in their language. So far as we may venture to think of the intervening stages of that growth in wisdom and stature, we can see in the Old Testament Scriptures what was for Him the one outward record of the revelation of the divine wisdom,—in the discipline of life, the "things which He suffered" (for sufferings there must have been before the commencement of His special ministerial work), that which led Him beyond the letter to the true meaning of prophecy or law,—in the teaching of the Spirit, that which gave to the two a divine unity.[2]

But He grew also "in favour with God and men." The life now attracted men. As yet the winning

[1] The connexion indicated by Acts iv. 1; v. 17, was of considerable standing, and should be borne in mind through the whole of the Gospel history.

[2] Whatever estimate men may form of the relative excellence of Milton's two great poems (I am myself disposed to accept what is said to have been the poet's own judgment), the "Paradise Regained" deserves a special study as the

side of holiness and truth, before they are called on to wage their sharp warfare with the world's evil, was all that was presented to others. In his own village, Nazareth; in neighbouring towns like Cana and Capernaum; in the journeys to Jerusalem through Peræa, or, it may be, even through Samaria, His presence was welcomed. Year after year brought their changes: first came the life of obedience, then of independence. Joseph's death (there is no mention of him after that visit to the temple) caused Him to be known no longer as the carpenter's son only, but as Himself the carpenter. His brethren and His friends followed the normal order of men's lives, and formed new ties, and entered on new homes. For Him, waiting till His hour should come, living a life consecrated to one special work, no such ties were possible. They had been renounced by the Master, as they have been renounced in ten thousand instances by the disciples (the *μιμηταὶ Χριστοῦ*, among whom St. Paul classed himself), "for the kingdom of heaven's sake."[1]

first attempt, deliberately and reverentially made, to work out the thought of the development of our Lord's human life. With some allowance for an intermingling, here and there, of the poet's own experience, the magnificent passage in Book I., 196—226, may fairly be regarded as a very close approximation to the truth.

[1] The thought of such a renunciation as the necessary condition of the work to which He had devoted himself, is surely suggested by the strange and startling words of Matt. xix. 12. As in His human life He chose poverty rather than

It helps us but little to our apprehension of that life, though it may help us much to understand its subsequent history, and the progress of the faith that rested on it, to think of the changes that were passing in the great world of kingdoms or of thoughts. Tiberius might succeed Augustus; one procurator might follow on another; high priests might degrade their office with an infinite debasement; the circle of those who looked for redemption in Jerusalem might grow narrower or wider; but these changes would affect the Galilæan village in the least conceivable degree, and would come into no contact with His life. Of one event, or series of events only, can we think with any such relation, and that relation must have been of striking contrast. In the year A.D. 6 began the war of independence which the taxing of Quirinus, when carried to its natural consequences, had provoked: and Galilee was the scene of it; Judas the Galilæan its leader. From many a town and village men flocked to his standard. The very name be-

wealth, suffering rather than enjoyment, so He *chose* a virginal celibacy rather than the highest and purest form of the life of home. As in so many instances, so in this, His human life was after the pattern of the Prophet of Anathoth, whose sufferings were so like His own, and whose very words He so often reproduced (Jer. xvi. 2),—even as that of the Apostle who followed in His footsteps (1 Cor. vii. 1, 8) was after His.

came for a time as famous as had been that of the Maccabee.[1] Then, and for years afterwards, men's hearts beat to the cry, "We have no King but God." They sought, after their fashion, to restore the Theocracy. They may, for a time, have even looked on Judas as the Messiah. But the stir and the conflict did not touch the home at Nazareth, nor those who may even then have come within the range of its influence. One disciple only in the later history bears traces in his name of having been among the zealots who owned Judas as their leader.[2] It was not by any such assertion of independence that the kingdom of God was to be established. That violent attempt at setting aside an order which was ordained of God as the best remedy for the evils of the time, could not but fail utterly. The very process which it

[1] Even Josephus, from his point of view, looks upon the followers of Juda as being as distinct a sect as the Pharisees and Sadducees who are so prominent in the Gospel history. *Ant.*, xviii. 188; *B. J.*, ii. 891.

[2] Simon Zelotes. The other name, Καναν*ί*της (mistranslated Canaanite, as though it indicated Gentile birth), is, in the judgment of nearly all interpreters, identical in its meaning. The only other tenable explanation, which sees in the name a description of this Simon as of Cana of Galilee, leaves the meaning of Zelotes and the inference from it untouched. The class is probably alluded to in the words which speak of violent men (βιασταὶ = ζηλωταὶ) taking "the kingdom of heaven by force" (Matt. xi. 12). It was natural enough that the scattered adherents of the Gaulonite should welcome, with whatever expansion of thought and hope, another Galilæan Teacher, whom His disciples recognized as a king, the Son of David.

attempted to impede went on with greater rapidity. The towns of Galilee assumed more and more a Roman character. Antipas and Philip built their cities on the lake of Gennesareth, or near the sources of the Jordan. Roman customs duties were collected by half-apostate Jews; Roman cohorts stationed at Capernaum. The legion impressed itself on men's minds as the type of supreme, irresistible power.[1] The language and, to some extent, the thoughts of Greece became, there as elsewhere, the medium of intercourse between the conquerors and the conquered. In some cases the contact led to a mutual sympathy and respect which, to the minds of the Pharisee at Jerusalem, or the heated frenzy of the Gaulonite, would have seemed inconceivable.[2]

The silence of the Gospel narrative as to the whole period is, as I have said, significant. But we best appreciate the significance, not on the one side by simply refusing to think at all what the life was which was reaching its maturity in the interval, nor yet by constructing a fictitious biography such as feeling or imagination might suggest, but by striving to bring before our minds all that we can gather

[1] Compare the cry of the demoniac, Mark v. 9.

[2] So the centurion builds a synagogue, and the elders attached to it come to the Prophet of Nazareth interceding, not for the centurion himself only, but even for his slave.

as to the circumstances that clustered round the life, and then remembering how far they were from making up the life itself, how little they had to do with it. As it is true of disciples, according to the measure of their discipleship, that their "life is hid with Christ in God,"[1] so was it true that His humanity grew to its completeness in the silence of fellowship with His Father; and the condition of that fellowship with Him, as with us, was prayer—prayer for Himself, for His countrymen, for mankind. Whatever burning zeal for His Father's house, or indignation against hypocrisy and formalism, whatever meekness and gentleness, whatever yearning after the fallen or the outcast, whatever width of love going out to Samaritan and heathen we find in the full-grown manhood, we may well believe to have been the crown and completion of this silent growth. But that silence was at last broken by the voice of the Baptist.

We would fain know also how the life of that teacher had passed through its several stages, while the stainless holiness at Nazareth was growing to its perfection. But here there is even less to guide us. The "child waxed strong in spirit, and was in the deserts until the time of his showing forth

[1] Col. iii. 3.

unto Israel."[1] That is the only record. The facts connected with his birth just help us to fill up the gap with a few rough outlines. A childhood visibly consecrated by the Nazarite's vow; a training, such as would be given to a priest's son, in the holy writings of his people; here also a gradual ripening of the consciousness of his mission, waiting till the hour should come—years of meditation and prayer, preparation for the office of a prophet superseding the special functions of the priesthood; the Nazarite abstinence passing into Rechabite austerity;[2] the habits of cities, with their softness and weakness, renounced for the dress and food of the dwellers in the wilderness,—these were the chief features of the life. How far, during the years between childhood and maturity, the two met, we know not. The relationship between the two mothers, each conscious of the greatness of her vocation, makes it probable that Christian art has seized on a truth in its representation of the companionship between the two children. At some at

[1] Luke i. 80.

[2] The choice of the life of the wilderness instead of that of cities, the rough garment of camel's hair, the total abstinence from wine and strong drink, even the locusts and wild honey, were all revivals of the old type of wild nomadic life which, under Jonadab the son of Rechab, had assumed a religious and half prophetic character. For fuller details as to the order, and the probability of its being represented even among the priests and scribes, see art. "Rechabites" in Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*. The life of Banous, the teacher of Josephus (*Vit.*, c. 2), presents another example of the same type of life at the same time.

least of the feasts at Jerusalem, the son of Zacharias must have been present as well as the household of Nazareth, and could hardly have remained indifferent to what concerned Him in whom his mother had learned to see the heir of the house of David. His words and acts, when they meet, imply a reverence founded upon at least a partial knowledge; but it is clear also that the knowledge was but partial. The two lives ran, for the most part, parallel to each other. At last, when the time arrived, they were brought into contact.

In some way, as mightily and distinctly as in the case of Isaiah or Jeremiah, the "word of the Lord came unto John, the son of Zacharias, in the wilderness."[1] With him, as with so many others, the Nazarite passed into the prophet.[2] Words were heard, the like of which, in their boldness of reproof, their utterance of truth, their tidings of coming judgment and coming joy, had not been heard since the days of Malachi. The age of scribes, it had been

[1] We are so much in the habit of taking the words as a mere phrase to express inspiration, that it is well to remember that in the history of the older prophets it is associated for the most part with some great crisis in their inner life, with new powers, a new revelation of the Divine mind, the sense of a new calling. Compare Isa. vi.; Jer. i.; Ezek. ii.; Amos iii. 7, 8.

[2] Samuel is, of course, the great example of the union of the two characters (1 Sam. i. 11), but Elijah, though not named as such, has the distinguishing Nazarite feature of the long flowing hair (2 Kings i. 8). Amos places the two in the closest possible juxta-position (ii. 11, 12).

said, had succeeded the age of prophets, and men had yearned for the appearance of a prophet, and for the restoration of the Urim and Thummim, as for possibilities equally remote.[1] Now there were signs that it too was to pass away in its turn before another outpouring of the prophetic spirit. Had he done no more than thus speak he would have met the popular standard of a prophet's life and work. But he did more than this; he came baptizing with water, and this at once gave his mission a new character, and caused new perplexity. No prophet before him had ever so acted. Manifold as were the ablutions of the Jews, it is doubtful whether this immersion of the whole body in pool or stream was in any degree familiar to them as a religious rite to be performed once for all, and with a deeper significance. If it were, it was only as an accompaniment to circumcision in the admission of proselytes from heathenism.[2] By what stages of thought or sudden intuition he had been led to it; what associations it would wake up in the minds of the people,—these, though they are not recorded, we may, without much

[1] Ezra ii. 63; Neh. vii. 65; 1 Macc. iv. 46; ix. 27.

[2] Admitting the possibility of the practice of baptizing proselytes having been copied from the Christian rite, I yet hold that the balance of evidence is in favour of ascribing it to an earlier period. See the articles "Baptism" (by Bishop Harold Browne), and "Proselytes," in the *Dictionary of the Bible.*

risk of error, infer from its results. One whose mind had fed on the prophecies of Isaiah and Jeremiah and Malachi,—who had been brought to see in himself the "voice crying in the wilderness,"—must have been led to see also that he was but preparing the way for one mightier than himself,—the "Servant of the Lord," the "Anointed," the "Rod out of the stem of Jesse."[1] A kingdom of God was at hand, and the special note of that kingdom was a "new covenant."[2] That covenant required a sign and token to witness to men's minds what it was, as the old had had the blood of sprinkling for its sign. That which was to be its inner essence was that it was to speak to the spirits of men; the law was to be written in their hearts. They were to be raised to a height as far above the state in which they then were as the faith of Israel was above the idolatry of the heathen. They, too, needed to "wash and make them clean."[3] If "a new heart and new spirit" were to be given them, the outward expression of that change was the promise, "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean."[4]

[1] Isa. xl. 2; xi. 1. [2] Jer. xxxi. 31. [3] Isa. i. 16.

[4] Ezek. xxxvi. 25. It may be questioned whether those who have treated of this subject have adequately appreciated the significance of the language in which Josephus speaks of it. According to him, the baptism was "*not* for the remission (*παραιτήσει*) of any sins, but for the purity of the body" (*Ant.*, xviii. 612). It is possible that he may have intended in this way to dis-

The impression made by this startling deviation from the traditions of the schools was striking and immediate. Under the power of the prophetic word the secrets of men's hearts were opened. The burden of their sins became grievous and intolerable, and they were compelled to reveal, each man the plague of his own heart, to the Baptist and to each other. At first those who came were the classes whom the rabbis of Jerusalem left neglected and untaught, the common people, the publicans and sinners.[1] Soon the movement spread upward, as other like movements have spread in later times. Pharisees and Sadducees themselves came, led by curiosity, or catching for a time the contagion of the multitude.[2] But they came without confession, without amendment, trusting in their descent from Abraham, condescending to patronize the new teacher, and assume the religious enthusiasm of the people. He rejected such patronage, desired no such converts, and the Scribes fell back upon the scorn which their fathers had dealt out to the older prophets. "There was something wrong. His mind had been unsettled;

tinguish it from heathen ceremonies of expiation more or less analogous; but remembering when he wrote, it seems a much more natural conclusion that he aimed a side-thrust at those who looked on the baptism of John, and on their own, as being "for the remission of sins."

[1] Luke iii. 12; Matt. xxi. 26, 32. [2] Matt. iii. 7.

he had a devil, and was mad."[1] Those who did come to him with loving trust found in him the guidance they needed. Rigorous as was the austerity of his own life, he did not impose it as a rule binding upon all. Publicans, soldiers, peasants, got from him the precepts which they needed for the struggles and temptations of their common life.[2] Those who were led to avow themselves his special scholars—these, too, chiefly of the poor—fasted as he fasted,[3] repeated the prayers which he taught them,[4] waited for the coming of the kingdom and the King that he had told them of. Among these were some, at least, whose names were afterwards to be memorable for ever. The fame of the Baptist had spread even to the towns and villages of the Sea of Galilee, and drew the fishermen and artisans from the common task-work of their lives. Hopes which the revolt of Judas of Galilee might have stirred but could not satisfy, kept them hanging on his lips. In that crowd of listeners, confessing their sins, plunging into the Jordan, were the sons of Jonah and the sons of Zebedee.[5]

There also was One who came as the carpenter from Nazareth, known as the son of a widowed mother

[1] Matt. xi. 18. [2] Luke iii. 7—14. [3] Matt. ix. 15.
[4] Luke xi. 1. [5] John i. 35—42.

whom He honoured with a true obedience, working as others worked, with a life pure and stainless, from whose lips no one had ever heard words of anger or deceit. He too came to be baptized. But here that which with others was the condition of baptism was wanting. He had no acts of transgression to confess.[1] But He felt, as every human soul must feel in proportion to its freedom from sin, the need of perpetual and ever-increasing fellowship with His Father in heaven: that what was for others the appointed token of a new covenant and of the Divine kingdom must be so for Himself also. His freedom from evil, His victory over temptations to which others yielded, could not lead Him to separation from His brethren, could only lead, as it has done in all instances after that pattern, to a more complete identification with them. John, from the measure of knowledge which he had before, or from the impression made on him now, may have shrunk from bringing under the baptism of repentance one who had nothing to repent of—may have yearned to be the disciple, and not the master, of one so filled with wisdom; but He asserted, as with strongest emphasis,

[1] In the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, as quoted by Jerome (*c. Pelag.*, iii. 2), the Mother of the Lord and His brethren urge Him to go to the baptism of John, as they have done, and He makes answer, "*Quid peccavi, ut vadam et baptizer ab eo?*"

the truth that it was meet that He should thus "fulfil all righteousness."[1] Pure and spotless as that life had been, its obedience was not as yet "perfected." It had not yet risen, as a human life, to all the height, nor fathomed all the depth, of the righteousness of God.

The signs and wonders of the baptism which followed were, as the narrative of the Gospels shows, apart from the presence of the multitude.[2] To see the heavens opened and the Spirit descending "like a dove,"[3] and to hear the voice from Heaven, was not given to them then, any more than it was given to the multitude at Jerusalem to hear the like witness afterwards, or to the Sanhedrim to see, as Stephen saw, the Son of man sitting at the right hand of God,[4] or to the soldiers who accompanied Saul of Tarsus to see the face and hear the words of the Lord Jesus.[5] For the

[1] Matt. iii. 15.

[2] In St. Matthew and St. Mark there is no mention of any bystanders. In St. Luke the words, "when all the people were baptized," give a note of time, but do not necessarily involve their presence. The words of the Baptist, in John i. 32, imply that he was bearing testimony to a fact which others had not witnessed, even if they had been present.

[3] So far as we may venture to interpret the symbolism, it seems clear —(1) that it directly indicated the "meekness and gentleness" of which the dove was the type (Matt. x. 16), and which the life of the Christ was to manifest in their perfection; and (2) that it presented a contrast to the more terrible cherubic forms through which the power of the Spirit had come to another "Son of man" by the banks of Chebar (Ezek. i.).

[4] John xii. 29; Acts vii. 56. [5] Acts ix. 7; xxii. 9.

two, to whose testimony all the record of it must ultimately run up, it was the apocalypse they had waited for. The Baptist learned that his work was not in vain. The Christ stood there, filled with the Spirit, which he had received only in partial measure, declared to be (whatever thoughts the Forerunner may have connected with the words) the "beloved Son, in whom the Father was well pleased."[1] And for the Son of Man Himself, we may well believe that witness was needed as part of the discipline by which He, too, was to be perfected. Given not to the multitude, but to Himself and to the Baptist, it was the testimony to His human spirit of the truth of all previous anticipations, foretastes, unfolding consciousness of His true relation to the eternal God. In the very act of identifying Himself with those who sinned, He satisfied the demand, the craving, so to speak, of the Divine Will for a perfect human sinlessness. On this humanity of the second Adam, as on that of the first, the Creator could look as with a divine joy, and pronounce that it was "very good."

And the record that follows shows—unless we do violence to the words of the Evangelists—that this was the calling forth of powers that had hitherto been latent. That descent of the Spirit was no mere

[1] Matt. iii. 17.

sign of what had been before, but the reality of a mighty change, acting on His human soul, as it had acted previously on the souls of prophets, and acted afterwards on the souls of the disciples. Till now, "the grace of God had been with Him," and He had "been filled with wisdom" and holiness; but now, as by a constraining power, He was "led up by the Spirit into the wilderness." Away from the presence of the crowd, away from all human teachers (like the disciple who afterwards, in this as in so many other things, was a "follower," an "imitator" of Christ), "conferring not with flesh and blood," fasting as Moses and Elijah had fasted before Him, "neither eating nor drinking,"[1]—He entered into the solitude in which man holds converse with God, "saw and heard" what He was afterwards to speak, ascended, as it were, into the heaven of heavens, saw the mystery of the work before Him, and the path by which it was to be accomplished.[2] Of that temptation in the wilder-

[1] Gal. i. 16; Acts ix. 9.

[2] The mysterious words of John iii. 13, spoken so soon after the experience of the wilderness, suggest this as, at any rate, their most natural explanation. So taken, they present a striking parallelism to the words in which St. Paul speaks of himself as having been "caught up to the third heaven" (2 Cor. xii. 2); and to the "Come up hither," spoken as by the voice of a trumpet to St. John (Rev. iv. 1), even as the apostle's statement, that in some such way the whole truth of God was revealed to him (Ephes. iii. 3), answers to the words "We speak that we do know, and testify that we

ness it has been well said that it is the one narrative in the whole Gospel history which rests (unless we reject it as a legend—and the improbability of such a legend at such a time is simply infinite) on the solitary testimony of our Lord himself.[1] Through whatever channels it may have passed, it must have come primarily from Him. And this, it need hardly be said, gives a special significance to every circumstance connected with it. Even that briefest narrative of St. Mark has touches of its own which we could ill spare. "The Spirit driveth Him into the wilderness." This speaks of one who was passing through the experience of the older prophet, himself also known pre-eminently as a "son of man," when the Spirit lifted him up, and the hand of the Lord was strong upon Him, and he saw the glory of the Lord.[2] "He was with the wild beasts." This tells of the strange and terrible loneliness, where the one sound that broke the silence was the cry of the jackal or the panther, and the only forms of earth that met the eye to which the heavens were opened, were those of the brute creatures which have become in their craft and their ferocity sym-

have seen,"—the truth so known and seen being the "heavenly things' which He then declared, the love of God manifesting itself through the only-begotten Son, in the work of atonement and reconciliation.

[1] *Ecce Homo*, p. 15. [2] Ezek. iii. 12—14.

bols of the intensest evil.[1] And then there came the conflict with that evil itself. Not in any struggle with lawless thoughts arising from within (that struggle, if it could have come at all, must have come before), not in the machinations of any priest or scribe (as mere purblind dulness has led some to imagine);[2] but from a personal power of evil, the reality and might of which is perceived in exact proportion to a man's apprehension of the reality and might of good,[3] did that temptation come. And in each form it started not—as our temptations, for the most part, start—from the weakness or the passions of a tainted nature, nor, as has been said of late, from the "nascent consciousness of supernatural power,"[4] but from the revelation so lately given to His human spirit, that He was in very deed "the Son of God, in whom the Father was well pleased." "If thou be the Son of God,"—that was the tempter's weapon. To believe in that

[1] There would seem to have been some kind of connection between the fact thus recorded and one of the temptations. The words which the tempter cites from Psa. xci. 11, 12, might well appear likely to lead astray one who had already moved unhurt among the "lion and adder," the "young lion and the dragon."

[2] This explanation, though adopted by the older school of Rationalists, as represented by Rosenmüller and Kuinoel, and reproduced recently by Lange, was rejected even by Paulus. Bengel, strange to say, while maintaining the reality of the temptation, suggests that the tempter appeared "sub schemate," γραμματέως. [3] See Note I, on the Personality of Evil. [4] *Ecce Homo*, p. 12.

Sonship and to put forth the power over nature which it implied, that He might still the cravings of His own hunger, instead of trusting in the love of His Father, and believing that He who gives the higher life will sustain the lower; to doubt that Sonship, and test its reality by insisting on the fulfilment, in the letter, of words which are true with a truth far higher than any literal meaning could be; to abandon and deny it, and take the broad path to power and greatness through violence and falsehood; to lay the foundation of a Divine kingdom in practical denial of the Divine sovereignty, — these were the three forms of evil by which He was assailed. And in each case, the weapon with which the tempter was driven back was the "sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God." In that hour of bitterest warfare, He found His strength (as thousands have found since), in the simplest lessons of childhood. The words which of all words were most familiar to every Israelite, written on the doorposts of his house or tied on his forehead or his arms, these were enough (when they were received as in very deed the living word of God, not merely as the precepts of a book), to achieve deliverance.[1] That

[1] It is remarkable that the words which formed our Lord's answers to the tempter came, all three, from the same section of Deuteronomy, and that two of them formed part of the texts of the Tephillin.

word taught men that there was a higher life than that which they maintain by bread. It encouraged them to trust in God in the midst of all dangers and adversities; it forbade them to make demands or exact conditions which were destructive of all trust. To bow down to any form of evil for the attainment of even the highest good, was practically to act as if evil, and not good, were seated upon the Eternal Throne.

The temptation, thus resisted and overcome, bore its natural fruit in a wonderful tenderness and sympathy. To yield to evil is to lose, just in proportion as we yield, the power of sympathizing with its victims; for sympathy implies unselfishness. To conquer evil in ourselves is to gain, in proportion as we conquer, the power of clear insight, divine compassion, dauntless hope, and courage in dealing with it in others. And something of this is traceable as its immediate fruit here. The Baptist, as if a new truth were borne in upon his mind by the teaching of the Spirit, as he looked on the Form and Face which, being truly human, must have borne the traces of that prolonged fast and tremendous conflict, even as afterwards it was "marred more than any man," worn with weariness and sorrow, pointed to Him now, not as a King coming to conquer, but as a Lamb

coming to be slain ; bearing the sin of the world, as the scape-goat bore the sins of Israel into the wilderness.[1] With no signs or wonders,—through the mere attraction of gracious words and, it would seem, of looks which spoke of purity, truth, sweetness, and peace ineffable,—He won the hearts of the disciples who were afterwards to be chiefest of the apostles.[2] So, in the joy of finding one who met the wants of their hearts, and read their secrets, they confessed that they had found the Christ—a king such as

[1] If the words "Lamb of God" stood by themselves, we should probably be led to refer them to the Paschal sacrifice. The second clause would as distinctly suggest the scape-goat. The union of the two seems intended to imply that the truths symbolized by each met and were fulfilled in the one perfect antitype. But there is an unmistakeable reference, also, to the prophecy of the servant of the Lord in Isa. liii., who was to be "brought as a lamb to the slaughter," and "bear the iniquities" of "many." The Baptist had seen the pattern of his own life in the "voice crying in the wilderness" of Isa. xl. 3, 4. The manner in which he dwells on that correspondence shows how closely all his Messianic hopes were connected with the second part of the book that bears Isaiah's name, and it was natural that one who had so begun should go on farther. The indelible impression which the words made on the disciple who heard them is shown (1) by his seeing in the facts of the crucifixion a fulfilment of the laws of the Passover (John xix. 36), and (2) by the appearance of the same symbol in the visions of the Apocalypse (Rev. v. 8—14; vii. 9—17). The words of St. Peter (1 Pet. i. 19) are nearly as distinct an echo of them. That the same thought pervaded the mind of the Church is seen in 1 Cor. v. 7, 8. The conjecture of the writer of *Ecce Homo* (p. 6), that the Baptist, without any thought of sacrificial imagery present to his mind, contrasted the tranquillity of Jesus with the restless vigilance of his own life as the watch-dog of the flock, is open to the objection that the Baptist had probably never seen a dog so employed, or thought of that animal as other than a ravenous and unclean beast.

[2] John i. 37, 46.

the prophets had dreamt of—the friend of the outcast and the poor. They asked as yet for no other evidence than this. "Come and see" was their only answer to the doubting questioner. One by one they gathered round Him, first in Galilee, then in Judæa, and before long the popularity of the new teacher first rivalled, and then eclipsed, that of His forerunner. He continued that forerunner's work at first with little change. He, too, proclaimed that the kingdom of heaven was at hand, and through His disciples baptized all who sought admission into it.[1]

The stages of that work will have to be traced, at least in outline. But it may be well, before passing on, to note some facts as to the ministry of the Baptist which will help to throw light on them.

1. Though he had recognized that one mightier than himself had come, he yet continued his own work, preaching and baptizing as before. His disciples were a distinct body, with their own rules of life, their own forms of prayer, during part at least, perhaps the whole, of our Lord's ministry. The effects of that preaching were not confined to Palestine. Wherever there were Jewish synagogues, brought by pilgrimages or letters into any kind of intercourse with the Holy City, there its influence must have

[1] Matt. iv. 23; Mark i. 15; John iv. 1.

been felt. And it prepared the way, traceably and mightily, for the fuller preaching of the Gospel of Christ, as St. Paul proclaimed it. In the converts at Ephesus, and in the great Alexandrian teacher, mighty in the Scriptures,[1] we find representative examples of the wide-spread vibrations and distant echoes of the "voice that cried in the wilderness."

2. There is at this stage a change in the language of the ruling class in Judæa as to the Baptist and his teaching. Whatever may have been the nature of that dispute between the disciples of John and some unknown Jewish teacher[2] about purification, the mere fact of such a dispute shows that the breach was widening. At first they, as well as the poor, had mused in their hearts whether he were the Christ or not,—had sent their delegates to him, had

[1] Acts xviii. 24, 25; xix. 3.

[2] John iii. 25. The singular is supported by a preponderant number of the older uncial MSS. What the nature of the dispute was we can, of course, only conjecture, but it was clearly one which forced upon the mind of the Baptist's disciples the conviction that there was now another Master, recognized as higher than their own. What seems most likely is, that the Jew teacher was one who, like Nicodemus, had come in contact with the wider truths of a new birth by the power of the Spirit (John iii. 5, 6) or of the true purity of heart which was independent of any ceremonial purifications (Matt. xv. 16—20). It is probable enough, in the nature of things, that as the disciples of the Baptist agreed with the Pharisees in their rules of fasting and prayers, so they would in this point also. If there were any of those disciples who thought of his baptism (as Josephus speaks of it) as an outward act of corporeal purity, this might well lead to remonstrance from one more enlightened than themselves.

even tendered themselves as candidates for his baptism.[1] Now there comes the scornful judgment, "He hath a devil." They reject the purpose of God manifested towards them.[2] And this is precisely at the time when he is most of all disclaiming independence, rejoicing in the triumph of the new Teacher who has come from above, rising, as the tone of his comment on the dispute just mentioned seems to show, to greater spirituality of teaching.[3]

3. The imprisonment which so soon followed was, we must believe (wearisome and trying as were all its circumstances), the true discipline for the Baptist's life,—it may be, the full answer to his prayer. In no other way could he have been removed so effectually from the position of a rival teacher, which his disciples might have forced upon him. The joy of decreasing that his Lord might increase might have seemed now to be fulfilled indeed. The one drawback, the great trial and misery of the imprisonment, was that it shut him out from seeing and hearing of that increase fully, and taking the true measure of its meaning. Days and weeks and months passed, and still the

[1] Matt. iii. 7; John i. 19—24. [2] Matt. xi. 18; Luke vii. 30.

[3] John iii. 25–36. What is conspicuous is the readiness not only to give up fame and influence, but to recognize the teaching of the Prophet whom he had baptized, as, in a higher sense than his own had been, the "words of God," coming, not, like his, from a partial, but from the fullest inspiration.

guilty triumphed and the world went on, and his heart began to fail within him; and so, in the bitterness of the "hope deferred" which "maketh the heart sick," he sent to ask the question which presents so strange a contrast to his former distinct confession.[1] In accents of remonstrance, sadness, reproach almost, rather than mere doubt, he asks, "Art thou He that should come, or do we look for another?" The answer to that question will have to be examined when we are dealing with the miracles of Christ in their relation to the grounds of faith. It is enough to note, in regard to the part which speaks of supernatural works of goodness and power, that it precisely met the need of the half-sinking faith. It gave it something to which it could cling, from which

[1] The narrative of St. Matthew (xi. 2—6) and St. Luke (vii. 18—23) contains nothing to support the notion that the Baptist sent the disciples in order to remove their doubts, nor yet that he himself was ignorant of the power and goodness of his successor. The time when he sent his disciples was precisely after they had come to tell him of the works of Christ, and those works included the miraculous healing of the sick and restoration of the dead. What the question indicated was the impatience to which the tidings might naturally give rise. "Why should He who could do so much hold back from the full manifestation of His kingdom? Was He going, after all, to leave the great work of a theocracy visibly restored to be accomplished by another?" The question and the answer both find parallels in what passed afterwards at Jerusalem,—"Then came the Jews round about Him, and said unto Him, How long dost Thou make us to doubt? If Thou be the Christ, tell us plainly. Jesus answered them, I told you, and ye believed not: the works that I do in My Father's name, they bear witness of Me," John x. 24, 25.

it might again rise to the height which it had once reached without the evidence which now it needed. But what calls for notice before we close the page which tells of the Baptist is the significance of the last clause,—"To the poor the Gospel is preached." They are evangelized; they hear and receive good news of great joy. Men have pointed again and again, and rightly, to the position of these words as showing that miracles of grace are a mightier proof than miracles of power; that Christendom, with all its ever-accumulating evidence of noble lives, sufferings borne patiently, holy deaths, is a truer witness of Christ than any prolonged series of physical wonders could have been. They have scarcely noticed enough, what a testimony they bear to the character and feelings of the Baptist himself. A message of this kind, however universal its teaching might become afterwards, must have been, at first, emphatically, intensely personal. The token kept to the last, was the strongest for *him*. Could he, with his sympathy for the poor,[1] desire any stronger proof that He that should come had come, than that He brought a blessing for them, and called them into His kingdom?

4. And then, before long, first the work, and then the life of the Forerunner, came to an end. Greater

[1] Luke iii. 11.

than any prophet that had been born of woman, as called to a higher office; greater in his Nazarite purity, his undeviating austerity, his dauntless courage, it was yet true that he that was least in the kingdom of heaven was greater than he. The mystery which was in the mind of Christ, which was revealed afterwards to apostles and prophets, was not revealed to him. He still stood on the level of Judaism, thinking of a theocracy of Israel. What was yet to come was the thought of a universal society, in which all barriers of race were to be broken down, the brotherhood of all men, the unity of mankind in Christ.[1] Slowly that truth dawned even upon the minds of Peter and of John. Even they were to be led to see it in its fulness only or chiefly through the teaching of one who never listened to the words of their Master as they had listened,—to whom it was made known, not by oral teaching, direct or traditional, but by a distinct apocalypse. The Baptist passed away before the dawning came. But we may well believe that the mists of perplexity

[1] As often happens in the discovery and development of truth, it was given to the Baptist to utter words of pregnant meaning without entering fully into their consequences. It is hardly too much to say that nearly the whole teaching of St. Paul as to the essential equality of Jew and Gentile in the sight of God, was latent in the words "God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham," Matt. iii. 9.

which for a time clouded his vision cleared away, and that though the nature, laws, limits of the divine kingdom remained undisclosed to him in their completeness, he yet departed as one whose eyes had seen the King in all the perfection of His beauty.

IV.

THE NAMES OF CHRIST.

IV.

THE NAMES OF CHRIST.

AS soon as the voice of John was heard in the wilderness of Judæa men began to muse in their hearts whether he were the Christ. The very first disciples who gathered round the new prophet to whom John had pointed, whispered one to another, "We have found the Christ." Everywhere and in all classes the expectation prevailed in some form or other. It is needless here to do more than refer to the well-known passages in Suetonius and Tacitus that describe it.[1] It extended (if we accept St.

[1] Sueton., *Vespas.*, 4; Tacit., *Hist.*, v. 13. The fact that the words of the historians refer to a later period shows the persistency of the hope amid all conceivable discouragements. But the hope itself is described as a "vetus et constans opinio," as pervading all the eastern provinces of the empire, as pointing to a revived sovereignty of Israel like that of the days of David. It was reserved for a Jewish priest to refer the expectation to the Messianic pro-

Matthew's narrative) to the sages of the farther East. It was found in the villages of Samaria.[1]

The existence of this wide-spread hope, gathering to a head the many hopes of all the "men of desires" of the past ages of Israel, has been turned, by one school of critics, into an argument against the truth of the history which purports to present us with their fulfilment.[2] "Expectations will embody themselves in legends. Men dream that they have found their heart's desire. This is the origin of all mythical narratives, among others of the mythical narrative of the Gospels. The history of the Christ is but the growth, partly spontaneous, partly fostered of set purpose, of thoughts that had been floating in men's minds for centuries." So stated, the hypothesis, like all theories that profess to solve the phænomena of history, has something which, to the merely critical intellect, is attractive. It brings the mysterious and

phecies of the Old Testament, and to find the Messiah in Vespasian (Joseph., *B. J.*, vi. 5, § 4).

[1] Matt. ii. 2; John iv. 25.

[2] It may, I think, be admitted that of all theories of the origin of Christianity which postulate the exclusion of the supernatural, that of Strauss presents the most coherent explanation of the phænomena. But to start with that postulate, instead of asking whether the phænomena do not lead to the acknowledgment of a Divine Will working upon nature and upon man, as their simplest and most natural solution, and then to reject all facts that do not square with that arbitrary hypothesis, has in it something of the character of a *petitio principii*.

infinite varieties of human action under an apparent law. It eliminates what is, to some, perplexing,—to others, it would seem, almost irritating,—the necessity of recognizing the presence of a power supernatural, and therefore possibly Divine, working through human agency. It satisfies the sense of superiority which leads a man to look down from his clear, cold sky upon those who take the shifting forms of cloud-land for realities.

But the theory is, as such, defective in many ways: —(1.) At the best it can only present one possible explanation of the way in which a given narrative came first to be composed and then believed; and, prior to the examination of evidence, it is altogether arbitrary to assume that it is the only one, or that it is more probable than the solution that we have the narrative because the facts occurred. (2.) The analogy of history tends to show that wide-spread expectations, cherished in silence, and working on the minds of a people, issue not in fictions but in facts. They bring about changes of creed or government. They find personal representatives. It might be possible to maintain that the whole life which the Gospels bring before us was fashioned and determined by these expectations, that the teacher whom men called the Christ devoted Himself to the work of de-

liberately fulfilling them. It would, I believe, be true to say that, read as He read them, interpreted as He interpreted, they formed part of the education of His human spirit. But it is against the analogy of other histories to think of such expectations as creating only the legend of a mythical hero, and of that legend as mightier in its effects on the world of thought and action than any actual narrative or actual life has ever yet been. We have not yet learned to set aside the historical reality of Cæsar, or St. Francis, or Luther, or Napoleon, and yet each of them embodied, in large measure, the wishes and expectations of his time. The question, how far a mythical element may have mixed itself with these or with other histories, is, of course, a legitimate one, and requires an answer.[1] (3.) It is, it may be added, psychologically untrue that the attitude of eager hope is a favourable condition for the acceptance of an unreality as real. Men in that temper, if not critical, are at least exacting. They are easily disappointed and thrown back. They pitch their standard high, and are not easily brought to acquiesce in that which falls below it. In exact proportion to the

[1] This applies, of course, not only to Strauss's method, but also to Renan's explanation of the wide-spread belief of the disciples in our Lord's resurrection and other supernatural facts.

intensity of their longing wish does it require an immense weight of evidence to lead them to accept as true that which, in every point conceivable, thwarts and contradicts it. A Christ cunningly devised to meet the yearning expectations of Israel would have lived a far other life and died a far other death than the Christ of Nazareth. In whatever degree we, taught by facts, may recognize in prophecies and foreshadowings the lineaments of a suffering Messiah, —in whatever measure He may have learnt from them the pattern to which He must conform Himself, nothing can be clearer than that such an ideal was infinitely distant from the minds of the Jewish people. Priests, scribes, peasants, publicans would have alike shrunk from it. "Christ crucified" was "to the Jews a stumbling-block." What we are required to believe is, that they accepted a mythus *because* it contradicted their expectations. The "credo quia impossibile" is forced upon us where we should least have looked for it. (4.) Great as are the difficulties of this explanation of the acceptance of the life of Christ by Jews with Messianic hopes which that life dashed to the ground, those which meet us when we apply it to the heathen world are hardly less. To some they may, perhaps, seem greater. For here there were absolutely no expectations. The world of Greek and Roman

society had given over hoping, and had acquiesced in the comparative order and tranquillity of the empire as meeting every wish for the revival of a golden age. Least of all were they looking to the obscure province of Syria for the appearance of a hero or a sage. The first question which the converts from heathenism, to whom the name of Christian was first applied, must have had to ask, would be, what did the name mean? "Christ" was not then, as it has become since, a proper name, which men might use instead of the more personal *Jesus*, or in conjunction with it. It was a predicate with a vast, manifold, indefinitely varied connotation. What that connotation was, we must now ask, in order to measure the claims of the Teacher to whom it was given, and the faith of the disciples who gave it. We may at least assume, without much fear of error, that the name and its associations could not have exercised any such strong fascination over the minds of Greeks and Romans, soldiers and peasants, statesmen and philosophers, as to lead them not only to believe what must have been, at least, most startling to them, but to live and die on the assumption of its truth.

I. At what remote period, or in what country, the sense of coolness and refreshment which the wearied frame derived from the act of anointing

came to be a parable of inward joy or energy, we know not.[1] It was a recognized symbol at the time of Exodus. Like other Israelite symbols, it appears to have had its starting-point in Egypt.[2] As soon as it was received into the alphabet of religious language, it gathered round it many distinct meanings. It was significant, not of refreshment only, but of strength; of the gift which a man needed for fulfilling a special task. In proportion to the greatness of the task, the material symbol itself was made more costly. For the priesthood there was the fragrant oil of Aaron's consecration.[3] The king was anointed "with the oil of gladness above his fellows."[4] It ran down to

[1] That this was the primary sense of the symbol seems beyond doubt. The life of joy is one which "lacks no ointment" (Eccles. ix. 8). Oil makes man's face to shine (Psa. civ. 15). When men are strengthened they are "anointed with fresh oil" (Psa. xxiii. 5; xcii. 10). Its earliest association with any religious act is seen in the consecration, by Jacob, of the pillar at Bethel on which he had slept in his journey to Padan-Aram (Gen. xxviii. 18). In Psa. cv. 15 it is applied (as is also the word "prophet") to the three great patriarchs, but this may be, in part, the transfer to an earlier time of the terminology of a later date.

[2] Assuming the early date of Exod. xxx. 26, it is legitimate to infer that the symbolism was not then introduced for the first time. In striking analogy with Jacob's act of consecration, the "holy anointing oil" was to be applied in the first instance to things—the tabernacle, the ark, the candlestick, and afterwards to the persons of Aaron and his sons. Representations of the act of anointing, as the token of kingly or priestly office, occur repeatedly in Egyptian monuments of very early date. Here also the oil is poured in a stream that runs over the whole body. See Wilkinson's *Ancient Egyptians*, v. pp. 279, 281.

[3] Exod. xxx. 22—25.

[4] Psa. xlv. 7.

the skirts of the high priest's clothing, to denote that the whole life needed the overflowing diffusion of a Divine grace.[1] So the Anointed of the Lord, the Messiah of Jehovah, became the recognized title of King, and Priest, and Prophet.[2] It was extended even to one in whom, though outside the pale of Israel, the prophets of Judah saw the agent of the Divine will. Isaiah did not shrink from speaking of Cyrus as the anointed, the Messiah.[3]

At what time, or in what way the name was first transferred from the historical associations of the past and present, and projected into the hopes of the remote future, is again somewhat uncertain. With whatever hopes Isaiah looked forward to the Branch that was to grow out of the root of Jesse, on whom should rest the spirit of wisdom and understanding and all kingly gifts, just, meek, righteous,[4] his words, when they failed of their fulfilment in the line of kings that sat upon the throne of

[1] Psa. cxxxiii. 2.

[2] So the name is used by Samuel at the very beginning of the monarchy of Saul, 1 Sam. xii. 5; and is applied to David, Psa. xviii. 50.

[3] Isa. xlv. 1. Looking to the close connexion between Daniel and Cyrus, it is possible that the word may have been literally applicable to the Persian king. He was, at all events, the true ideal type of a righteous Gentile ruler, as David had been of one of Israelite birth, and the prophet recognized in him a distinct Divine vocation. There is, I believe, no evidence of the symbolism of the rite being in use among the Persians.

[4] Isa. ix. 6, 7; xi. 1—9; lxi. 1.

David, must have awakened the hope of a true king, and therefore a true Messiah—a king that should reign in righteousness, seen as in all his glory. What would have grown naturally out of the Prophet's language elsewhere, received a direct sanction in the most glorious of his predictions. He heard as it were the very voice of that King in the land that was far off, describing His calling and His office. "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek."[1] So the hopes of men first turned to a future Christ. In the time of the book that bears the name of Daniel (I am not now concerned with questions as to its authorship and date), the word had acquired its distinct secondary meaning. Messiah the Prince, the Anointed, appeared in the vision of the seventy weeks,[2] and from that time the name was prominent in the hopes and dreams

[1] Isa. lxi. 1. A discussion of the authorship of the so-called Deutero-Isaiah prophecies would be out of place here. I have elsewhere (in *Good Words* for October, 1864) given at some length, though, of course, in a popular form, the reasons which lead me to think that there is a balance of evidence in favour of identity of authorship.

[2] Dan. ix. 25. Whatever date we assign to the words, they receive their significance from the prophecies of Isaiah that applied that title at once to the true heir of the promises of David, and to the "Shepherd" whom God had called from another race. The "Prince" when He came was to unite both characters, to "raise up the tribes of Israel," and to be "a light to the Gentiles."

of Israel, each man projecting his own ideal into the form with which he clothed it; the nation at large eager for conquest and revenge, and therefore looking forward with a ferocious exultation to a conquering and avenging Christ, while holier and nobler souls, learning their lesson more truly, craved for peace and truth, and waited for the consolation of Israel. It was felt, as the hopes of men rose to a higher pitch, that the Christ must unite in Himself all that the act of anointing had ever signified. The Spirit of the Lord must come, not as it came upon Samson and Saul, for sudden bursts of heroism or self-devotion, but must abide, to give the gifts of kingly wisdom and loving meekness. One who was only a king ruling his people in the name of the Lord, blessed though he might be, would not fulfil the true idea of the name. He must be the representative of His people in the sight of God, sympathizing with them, interceding for them; must be completely what David and Solomon had been but partially,—a "priest after the order of Melchizedek." In Him too was to be seen fulfilled that of which David and his son had also been partial representatives. They had had noblest gifts of wisdom and of utterance. The true Messiah could not fall short of them. His mouth must be as a sharp sword, and grace must be poured into His

lips. The Christ must be also a prophet. He must come to tell men all things that had been dark and hidden.[1]

There is no room for doubt, if we admit the faintest outline of truth in the Gospel history, that the Prophet of Nazareth did, from the first commencement of His ministry, act and speak in this character. His first appearance as a teacher, in the synagogue of His own village, was to read and apply to Himself the words which embodied the highest hopes of Isaiah: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me. He hath anointed me."[2] The feeling of this power to rule as King, to reveal God's will to them as a Prophet, to sympathize with them as a Priest, led those Galilæan disciples to receive Him as Christ, when as yet they had seen no sign or wonder. He received Peter's solemn confession that He was the Christ of God as a

[1] John iv. 25. The expectations spoken of are traceable, it need hardly be said, throughout the New Testament. Most prominent, of course, is the craving for a kingly Messiah, the Son of David. But the longing for a true priest, who should possess in their completeness the "light" and the "truth" of which the Urim and Thummim were the symbols, showed itself on the return from the captivity (Ezra ii. 63); and for a true prophet, in the time of the Maccabees (1 Macc. iv. 46; ix. 27); and as the years passed, the desires and hopes were more and more blended with each other. Jewish writings which, though belonging to a later, reflect the hopes of an earlier period, show the same mingling of expectations. The Messiah is identified with Michael, and Michael is the high priest of the unseen tabernacle. The "priest after the order of Melchizedek" is the King Messiah. Compare Schoettgen, *Hor. Hebr.*, "De Messiâ," vii. 2.

[2] Luke iv. 18.

truth that had been revealed not by flesh and blood, not by human passions or prepossessions, but by His Father in Heaven.[1] To the woman of Samaria, longing in her ignorance and sin for a Christ to tell her all things, He answered, "I am He."[2] Solemnly adjured by the high priest, when death was the consequence of the answer, He confessed and denied not, —"Thou sayest it."[3]

But side by side with this there is, after that first rejection at Nazareth, a marked reserve and reticence. He does not present Himself in that character to the multitudes either in Galilee or Jerusalem. He will not accept the testimony of the demoniacs when they own Him as the Christ.[4] He receives disciples even though they do not formally acknowledge Him by that name. He leaves the question, "Whom say ye that I am?" for a time open.[5] The Jews themselves taunt Him with leaving them in suspense,— "If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly."[6] It is as though He would have men feel that He was the Christ; feel that He fulfilled the Name as no one else

[1] Matt. xvi. 16. [2] John iv. 25. [3] Mark xiv. 61. [4] Luke iv. 41.

[5] The fact that the question was put shows that the confession had not been a condition of discipleship. They followed Him as a teacher, rabbi, prophet and then learned to see in Him the Christ. With some the recognition came at once, with others more slowly, in proportion, it may be, to the character of their previous expectations as fulfilled or surpassed by what they actually found.

[6] John x. 24.

had done, rather than so announce Himself, and prove His claim by miracles of power. When the disciples do make the confession, He welcomes it because it comes in the only way in which such a confession was worth anything; not as resting on the authority of man, not even on His own, but on the revelation of God, leading them to see in His human personality the true Anointed of the Lord, the King, the Prophet, and the Priest. In proportion as He finds any soul prepared to receive the truth does He reveal it.

II. Side by side with that name there was another, often in closest union with it, and dealt with in the same way. The Christ was also the "Son of God." This, too, had passed through very varying stages, and had been received with various shades of meaning. It had been used of all who, in their several degrees, stand in filial relationship to their Father in heaven; of the spirits who sang for joy when the foundations of the earth were laid;[1] of the judges and rulers who, because the word of the Lord came to them, were all the children of the Most Highest, and to whom, as such, even the very name of God (*Elohim*) was applied without impiety;[2] of those (whoever they may have been) who saw the

[1] Job xxxviii. 7.

Psa. lxxxii. 6. Comp. Exod. xxii. 9, and Judg. v. 8.

daughters of men that they were fair;[1] of Israel as the dear son of Jehovah;[2] of all who should one day be called the children of the living God;[3] of David and Solomon as set upon the holy hill of Zion.[4] Crowned with a new and transcendent meaning, it was the name which had been revealed at the baptism. The Baptist had borne his record that it was the true title. It had formed the starting-point of the attacks of the tempter. It was, after all its fulness had been gathered up and concentrated by its union with the Christ, to expand once again, as in a series of circles with that common centre. All men were taught that they, too, have a Father in heaven. His most solemn message to His disciples after His resurrection was to remind them that He was about to ascend to His Father and their Father.[5] We also, as St. Paul and St. John teach, are sons of God by adoption, children, and if children, then also heirs.[6] A word so wide in its range would not, taken by itself, have been sufficiently distinctive. Had the priests and Pharisees seen in it nothing more than this, they would not have based upon it a charge of blasphemy. But there is some-

[1] Gen. vi. 4. [2] Hos. xi. 1. [3] Hos. i. 10.
[4] 2 Sam. vii. 14, and, in its primary historical meaning, Psa. ii. 7.
[5] John xx. 17. [6] Rom. viii. 16; Gal. iii. 26; 1 John iii. 2.

thing more. It is throughout ascribed to the Prophet of Nazareth with a marked pre-eminence, and we must face the fact that it was not merely given but received. The voice from heaven had declared Him to be *the* beloved Son. Demoniacs and disciples alike confessed Him to be *the* Son of the living God. If it was a fault on the part of His accusers that they had started up in horror, or in hatred that affected horror, without even asking what the name meant in any case, or on what grounds and in what sense He applied it to Himself,[1] it was not the less true that He claimed it in a sense which would have startled any Jew who might have used the term as a Messianic epithet. He said that God was "His *own* Father, making Himself equal with God."[2] He declared, in words that led even priests and scribes to take up stones to stone Him, His oneness with the Father.[3] The mere claim of being the Christ would not have been regarded as blasphemy by those who had questioned with themselves whether John was the Christ or no, and were deceived again and again by the appearance of false Christs. It was because they saw in the words what seemed to them to imply a claim to the incommunicable Name, a participation in the Absolute Unity, that they condemned Him on

[1] John x. 31—36. [2] John v. 17—25. [3] John x. 30.

the ground that He spoke of Himself as "the Son of the Blessed."[1]

And with the name in this sense He dealt as with the name of Christ. There was to be no premature announcement. It was not used by Him in teaching the multitudes in Galilee. In Jerusalem, indeed, where there should have been a greater capacity for receiving it, the name is in one instance proclaimed fully, but words which were spoken afterwards led men to think that it might have been used in a lower meaning; and when its claim was to be made the ground of condemnation, it had to be drawn from Him by a solemn adjuration.[2] Men were to feel that God was with them, was in Him, that He was the Son of the living God. When He found one who so confessed Him He pronounced him blessed.[3] When He met with one whose faith was strong and devotion true, of him He asked, "Dost thou believe on the Son of God?"[4] The blind man to whom He put that question stood in relation to that truth as the woman of Samaria did to the truth of the Messiahship. There was in each case a wonderful power to receive the truth, which the scribes were wanting in; for in each the conscience had been roused into activity, and the

[1] Matt. xxvi. 63. [2] John v. 17—25; x. 34—36; Matt. xxvi. 63.
[3] Matt. xvi. 17. [4] John ix. 35.

secrets of their hearts laid open, and the light revealed to them the absolute truthfulness of Him who claimed the name.

III. These two titles, then, were at first whispered as in secret, confided to a few, claimed, but for the most part not proclaimed, accepted not demanded. There was a third, which was used in a far different way. The Christ was also the Son of Man; and by that name, with an indefinite frequency, He described Himself in the hearing of disciples and antagonists. This is significant in many ways. The fact that, with only three exceptions, the name is nowhere given to Him in any apostolic writings;[1] that the disciples seem, as by some religious instinct, to have shrunk from it, has been often noticed, as showing that the Gospels, in their present form, have an originality and independence of their own. They do not, in this respect, reflect the thoughts and language of the Apostolic Church. They represent the Christ as using language which that Church seldom or never used of Him; which none trained in any school of hers would have dreamt

[1] It is noticeable that in both instances they are applied to the Lord as revealed in vision to the gaze of His disciples. Stephen sees "the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God" (Acts vii. 56). The beloved disciple beholds "in the midst of the seven candlesticks," and "sitting on the cloud," "one like unto the Son of Man" (Rev. i. 13; xiv. 14). In the Gospels the name occurs 88 times, and in all of these is used by our Lord of himself.

of putting into any ideal or mythical account of Him. Every sentence in which the name occurs has in itself a presumptive evidence of being a true record. The very fact that it was the name He chose, makes the inquiry what it signified one of special interest. If we can take any estimate of what He meant in so speaking of Himself, what He purposed that others should learn from it, we shall clearly have taken a great step towards knowing the whole character of His mission, under what aspect He presented Himself to men, what was the first stage through which men were to pass before they entered the inner sanctuary where they believed and confessed that He was the Christ, the Son of God.

In the language of the older books of the Jewish Scriptures, the thought that was most conspicuous in the name "Son of Man" was the weakness and instability of human life. It occurs again and again as the emphatic repetition of that thought. "What is man, that Thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that Thou visitest him?"[1] In choosing it, therefore, the Christ identified Himself with that nature and with those conditions. He took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses. It was the proclamation that He, being human, claimed fellowship with all

[1] Job xxv. 6 Psa. viii. 4; cxliv. 3.

men, and counted nothing human alien from Himself. It is in that character, as the representative of mankind, that He claims power to forgive sins, and lordship over the sabbath rest.[1] It was because He was the Son of Man that He had received "authority to execute judgment."[2] (2.) If the name was uttered, as seems probable, in the older dialect of Palestine, its very sound would bear witness to another truth. He who bore it would call Himself, not as other Jews called Him, the Son of David,—not as other Jews boasted of being, the son of Abraham, but the *Son of Adam*.[3] Its testimony, so far, was in substance that which meets us in another form in St. Luke's genealogy. The idea of an universal family, of a kingdom in which there was no respect of persons, and all distinctions of race and descent were broken down, was there already in its germ. All the personal teaching of our Lord as to this truth, the whole Gospel of St. Paul, were

[1] Matt. ix. 6; Mark ii. 10; Luke v. 24.

[2] John v. 27. Significant as the words are there, they become yet more so when we compare them with Matt. xxv. 31,—"The Son of Man . . . shall sit on the throne of His glory: and before Him shall be gathered all nations."

[3] In Dan. vii. 13 we have the Chaldee form, *Bar-Enosh*, and so far there is a probability that this was the name used in our Lord's teaching. On the other hand, in all the earlier Scriptures the form is *Ben-Adam*, and the prominence given both by St. Paul and in later Rabbinic teaching, to the thought that the Christ is also the Second Adam, makes it likely that the two may have been used interchangeably.

but developments of it. (3.) In the speech of the two great prophets of the captivity, the name assumed a new significance. Partly, it may be, the exile itself had deepened the sense of sorrow, weakness, suffering, which the name implied, but so at any rate it was. To Ezekiel throughout,[1] to Daniel in the moment of his deepest terror and astonishment,[2] the word was spoken which named each of them as the "son of man." When the Christ chose that name, dwelt upon it, brought it continually before men's minds, it was a token that He chose the office of a prophet, such as it had been to them, with all its bitterness and conflicts. (4.) But above and beyond all this, the choice of the name involved a distinct reference to the most wonderful of all the prophecies of Daniel. He "saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days" (the Everlasting One), "and they brought Him near before Him. And there was given Him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve Him."[3] His "dominion" was to be "everlasting." As the vision came to the prophet, it at least taught him that out of the world's confusion One would make His way to a universal

[1] Ezek. ii. 1, 3, 8, and *passim*. [2] Dan. viii. 17. [3] Dan. vii. 13.

kingdom, not in the majesty of conquest, but through the suffering which was man's portion—One as truly tasting man's sorrow as Ezekiel or he himself had done. To the Jews who read that prophecy it may have suggested before our Lord's coming, as it certainly did afterwards, that this Son of man must be identical with the Christ.[1] Every utterance of the name by our Lord implied a tacit reference to this as the ultimate issue of all His suffering and humiliation. The confession before the Sanhedrim amounted to an actual citation,[2] and showed with what meaning the name had all along been used. The temptation in the wilderness took as its crowning stroke that of suggesting that He should claim the kingdom in some other way, of falsehood or of force, than the path of suffering and obedience which the name implied.

IV. It may seem an almost immeasurable descent from such high thoughts to pass to the titles of Jewish

[1] Comp. Schoettgen, *Hor. Hebr.*, ii. 263. The quotations given by him are, however, of a later date, and, here as elsewhere, he adheres to what is now an exploded error, and quotes from the book *Zohar* as though it represented the thoughts and language of the first instead of the thirteenth century. All citations from that book in illustration of the dogmatic language of the New Testament, wherever they are met with (and they appear without a *caveat* far too frequently), are to be regarded with extreme suspicion. At the furthest, all that can be said is that they may *possibly* represent the *kabbala*, or tradition, of an earlier time. The expression of wonder in John xii. 34 is rather at what had been said of the Son of Man than at the name itself, or its identification with the Messiah.

[2] Matt. xxvi. 64; Mark xiv. 62.

schools and the customs of Jewish synagogues, and yet we cannot pass over the fact that the character in which most men thought of Him, which was the first He distinctly assumed, was that of a Rabbi. With that title they came to Him—Master, Teacher, mounting sometimes up to the highest form of reverence, such as was paid to men like Hillel or Gamaliel. To other disciples we may well believe, as to Mary of Magdala, He was known as Rabboni.[1] True it was that He had never sat at the feet of any Gamaliel, and had never learned "letters" as the scribes learned them;[2] but men had not quite lost the feeling that there is a wisdom which cometh from above, and which may be independent of human teaching. As a rabbi, then, like other rabbis, He appeared in the synagogues and the temple, His seamless garment, woven from the top throughout, being probably the outward sign of the office.[3] To

[1] John xx. 16. On the whole of this aspect of our Lord's life, see Schoettgen's interesting *excursus*, "Christus Rabbinorum Summus," *Hor. Hebr.*, ii.

[2] John vii. 15. The γράμματα referred to included the whole circle of rabbinic training, the Scriptures, and the comments and traditions which were afterwards elaborated into the Mishna and the Gemara.

[3] Schoettgen, *Hor. Hebr.*, *l. c.* The description in John xix. 23 is sometimes referred to as connected with the priestly office of the Christ. But it is surely infinitely more probable that He wore the dress belonging to the title which He claimed and which all men gave Him, than one which would have brought on Him the charge that never was brought, that He was usurping the prerogative of the Sons of Aaron.

Him as Rabbi rather than as King, men came with their questions of casuistry about sabbaths, fastings, purifications, tribute money. As such, much more than in His kingly character, He was called on to act as arbitrator and divide inheritances.[1] As such, He was allowed to speak (as Paul and Barnabas were in Pisidia) in the sabbath services of the synagogue.[2] As such, devout women ministered to Him of their substance.

The relation in which He stood, in this character, to the other rabbis of the time, must have been in many ways one of entire contrast to all. Not by collecting and balancing all that had been handed down in the long succession of scribes, from the "men of the great synagogue" downwards, but speaking "as one having authority;"[3] not confining Himself to the cultivated and the thoughtful, and despising the "people of the earth," the brute, "accursed" multitude that knew not the law,[4] but looking on that multitude with an infinite compassion, and proclaiming a theology for

[1] The writer of *Ecce Homo* (chap. iv.) sees in these facts the assertion of a regal and legislative power; and the old ideal of a king as one who ought to listen to and redress the grievances of the least and lowest of his subjects (2 Sam. xv. 3—5), is, of course, in favour of this view. In the actual life, however, of the society in the midst of which the Christ appeared, these offices were conspicuously the province of the scribes.

[2] Luke iv. 16; Mark i. 21; John vi. 59; xviii. 20. [3] Matt. vii. 29.

[4] John vii. 49. "People of the earth" was the rabbinic formula of scorn for all the "unlearned and ignorant,"—all, that is, but their own disciples.

the people; using parables not as a test of cleverness among the few, but as a test of earnestness among the many,[1]—so He taught. The Prophet shone, even before the eyes of men, through the garments of the Rabbi. When we descend, however, to a closer survey of the schools of thought then dominant, we find gradations of contrast, points here and there of contact and resemblance. To the Sadducees, who represented, so to speak, the purest literal Judaism, opposing all progress beyond the letter of the law of Moses, rejecting all belief in immortality because they could not find it there, excluding or depreciating even the writings of the prophets, numbering their chief adherents among the higher members of the priesthood, making the Temple-services the centre of religious life, and having comparatively little sympathy with the wider and better influence of the synagogues, and yet so wanting in all true reverence for the Temple as to permit its courts to be turned into a cattle market and exchange, with these there could be no sympathy. They felt, from the moment that they recognized Him

[1] Even the calmer wisdom of the Son of Sirach bears traces of this scorn, and limits the study of parables to those who have leisure (Ecclus. xxxviii. 33). In our Lord's teaching they indicated, it is true, a certain reserve. He taught by similitudes instead of by the direct utterance of truth. But this change was, as it were, forced upon Him by the hardness of men's hearts; and even with this limitation, He brought the truth within the reach of thousands whom the scribes left as sheep that have no shepherd.

and His teaching as a power, that the war would be internecine. Though not His bitterest enemies at the commencement of His work (those who are at the opposite poles of thought seldom are so to any man), they were the party who urged on the crucifixion, and who showed themselves, after His ascension, the most resolute persecutors of His disciples.[1]

The Pharisees occupied a very different position. They had at one time been the representatives of the religious life of the people, and their influence had not been wholly for evil. They had fostered the synagogue system; cultivated habits of fasting, almsgiving, prayer, not only among their trained scribes and students, but among the people at large; had set their face against any shadow of idolatrous contamination; had enforced the holiness of the Sabbath, when intercourse with other nations threatened to

[1] Whatever can be urged as an "apology" for the Sadducees may be found in Mr. Twisleton's article in Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*. Many of the points on which he dwells well deserve consideration, but when he says that "they do not, like the Pharisees, seem to have taken active measures for causing our Lord to be put to death," he surely forgets that Caiaphas and those who acted with him were of the "sect of the Sadducees" (Acts iv. 6; v. 17). And the teaching of Christ, so far from being lenient towards them, as Mr. Twisleton represents it, puts the "leaven" of the two under the same ban (Matt. xvi. 6), and while enjoining obedience to what the Pharisees taught, as sitting in Moses' seat, *sc.*, as simply expounding the law, not adding their traditions to it (Matt. xxiii. 2), condemns the Sadducees far more emphatically as "not knowing the Scriptures, neither the power of God" (Matt. xxii. 29).

undermine men's reverence for it; had proclaimed by their very name that searpation from the world was the great duty of every Israelite. They had done all, or nearly all, that we look upon as entitling a religious order, or a religious party, to the respect and gratitude of mankind.[1] But their success had been fatal to them, as it has been fatal to other orders and other parties since. Popularity and applause, at first, it may be, the reward of earnestness, had become its motive, and so had first tainted and then destroyed it. The counterfeit had taken the place of the reality. Their fastings, alms, prayers, had become a means of influence or advancement. Their casuistry had become lenient to the

[1] Few questions are more obscure than that as to the time when the parties that are so conspicuous in the Gospel history first became known as such. Here I can only note what seems most probable. (1.) The tradition in the Talmud (*Bab. Berachoth*, f. 54), that there were heretics before the time of Ezra, who held that there was no life but the present, indicates a greater antiquity for the Sadducæan teaching than is commonly ascribed to it. (2.) That the precept ascribed to Antigonus, the son of Socho, that men were to serve God without thinking of reward (*Pirke Aboth*, c. 1), was probably a protest against the self-seeking spirit that afterwards showed itself in Pharisaism. (3.) That this starting-point of the sect (Antigonus having been president of the Sanhedrim after Simon the Just) explains its influence among the priesthood. (4.) That the most probable etymology of their name is that which connects it with Zadok, the disciple of Antigonus, and that that name is predominantly, if not exclusively, a priestly one. (5.) That the Pharisees, as succeeding to, or identical with, the Assideans (*Chasidim*, "holy ones") of 1 Macc. ii. 42; vii. 13; 2 Macc. xiv. 6, who looked to Judas Maccabæus as their leader, were associated with all the heroism of that struggle for nationality and freedom.

rich and oppressive to the poor. Their belief in immortality had issued in the transfer to the Divine judgments of the low thoughts of human traders. Sins were debts that men could pay; heaven an inheritance they could purchase. Their very zeal for God led them to crush every work of God which did not conform itself to their preconceived notions, and so they lost the power of recognizing and embracing truth. They interpreted the judgments of God where man cannot trace them—the fall of the tower of Siloam, the child born blind, the sudden slaughter of the Galilæans.[1] They failed to see those judgments where they came as the signs of the times, as the inevitable consequences of sin, and were written in their history in characters so plain that those might run that read them.[2] They had fallen into that worst form of hypocrisy which does not know itself to be hypocritical. They were wanting in all that sustains a religious party in any true life; wanting in freedom, in truthfulness, in sympathy.

But within that party there were two distinct schools, and our failure to recognize the difference between them obscures in part our perception of the order of events in the Gospel history, and of the bearing of our Lord's work on the schools of thought

[1] Luke xiii. 1, 4; John ix. 34. [2] Matt. xvi. 3.

around Him.[1] On the one side there were the followers of Shammai, zealots for the law, strictest of the strict, the Puritans and Orangemen of Pharisaism, rigid in the scrupulous observance of fasts and Sabbaths. On the other, there were the disciples of Hillel, with somewhat of a wider culture and more cautious temperament, attracted to the moral rather than the ceremonial side of religious life, rising sometimes to a height which half anticipated the ethical teaching of the Sermon on the Mount, or that of St. Paul and St. James as to the grounds of justification;[2] inclined to greater laxity in respect of the Sabbath, and divorce, and intercourse with other nations; a party, in some respects, of progress, with a life capable of being raised to better things. From the former came, as might be expected, the most resolute and persistent opposition to our Lord's teaching. From the beginning they felt that His

[1] See, for a fuller account, the article "Scribes" in the *Dictionary of the Bible.*

[2] Compare the precepts ascribed to Hillel in the *Pirke Aboth*, — "Love peace, strive after peace; love men, and lead them to the law. . . . He who strives after a name shall lose the name. He who does not make what he knows more makes it less" (i. 12, 13). "Trust not thyself till the day of thy death. Judge not thy neighbour till thou art as he is. . . . Say not 'If I have time I will do this or that again;' perchance thou wilt *not* have time" (ii. 13, 14). More striking still is the precept ascribed to him,—"Do nothing to thy neighbour that thou wouldst not have him do to thee." —Comp. Geiger, "De Hillele et Shammai," in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, xxi.

work and theirs were incompatible. With Him (I speak, for the present, of His work as a teacher only) were freedom, life, expansion; with them were the spirit of bondage, the immobility of death, the narrowness of isolation. So it was that they dogged His footsteps all along with malignant slander, and finally coalesced with their opponents (as only extreme parties can coalesce) in a mock trial and an appeal to the violence of the multitude. But with the other school, whom we can trace, though they are not named, through the whole Gospel history, the case was very different. They were attracted to a teaching which, so far as it was an exposition of the moral law, was like their own, even while it transcended it. They had risen above the lower dreams of a conquering Christ, had grown weary of the claims of false forerunners of such a Christ, had learned to adjourn indefinitely their expectations of His coming. They were content to welcome Him, when He appeared, as a rabbi, as "a teacher sent from God."[1] They defended Him, as far as they could without avowing themselves, in the debates of the Sanhedrim;[2] stole through the streets at night to the house where He lodged; believed in Him certainly as a prophet, possibly as the Christ;[3] were

[1] John iii. 2. [2] John vii. 50, 51. [3] John xii. 42.

not far from the kingdom of God;[1] absented themselves from the packed meeting that condemned Him;[2] waxed bolder after His death, and were willing to show honour to His body as that of a martyred prophet;[3] accepted the evidence of His resurrection; advocated a policy of caution;[4] and, still retaining their Pharisaism, became members of His Church.[5] Such men we know everywhere and at all times,—better than their school, fair dealing, cautious, temperate; men who keep their party from utter corruption,—who give it, so long as they continue with it, some chance of recovering its life; in whose presence there is some hope, whose departure is significant of decay and death. But they, these better Pharisees, followers of Hillel, were wanting—as the like class of men are often wanting still—in courage, zeal, earnestness. The element of enthusiasm, the element of faith, was absent. They temporized, and would wait for results. They could not see that a baptism with the Holy Ghost, a change as great as that of a second birth, was needed for them, though they might admit that it was wanted for heathens and publicans. They assented to a pure morality, but would neither act upon it when brought to a

[1] Mark xii. 34. [2] Luke xxiii. 51. [3] John xix. 38, 39.
[4] Acts v. 34—39 [5] Acts xv. 5.

crucial test, nor seek the power to rise to its requirements, nor repent, with any living and true repentance, of their transgressions against it. Turning their thoughts chiefly, and in proportion to their enlightenment, on the ethical aspect of the law, the witness borne by its sacrificial side fell into the background, and they did not see that more than morality was wanted. Noble as might be the wisdom of the Book of Proverbs, noble as might be the echoes of that book in extant or lost apocrypha, something more was wanted for the foundation of a kingdom; and that something they failed to find till it was revealed to them, not by flesh and blood, but by their Father in heaven.

Of other Jewish sects exercising but little influence on the national life,—the half-renegade scribes, who laid aside the dress and habits of their class,[1] and appeared among the courtiers of Herod in soft raiment and gor-

[1] In the reign of Herod the Great, when some of the scribes were struggling to maintain their freedom as religious teachers, others, under Menahem (the same name as the Manaen of Acts xiii. 1), less resolute and faithful, appeared one day in bright raiment, renounced the strict life of their order, and became the avowed partisans of the usurper. In this body of men and their successors we may probably recognize the Herodians of the Gospel history, and possibly also the teachers whom our Lord contrasts with the Baptist as those that "wear soft clothing," are "gorgeously apparelled and live delicately," and are found "in kings' houses" (Matt. xi. 7; Luke vii. 25). Comp. Jost., *Gesch. des Judenthums*, i., p. 259; *Dict. of the Bible*, art. "Scribes."

geous apparel; the Essenes, who withdrew from the world, and sought in monastic quietism a refuge from the troubles and a substitute for the hopes of Israel,[1] I need not now speak. They present but few points of contact with the Gospel history, and had not the slightest influence in determining its form. When

[1] The identification of the Therapeutæ of Philo (*Quod omn. prob. liber*, § 12) and the Essenes of Josephus (*Ant.* xiii. 5, § 9; xv. 10, § 4; xviii. 1, § 2; *B. J.*, ii. 8) with Christian apostolic communities may now fairly be considered as an exploded error. (See Mr. Westcott's article "Essenes" in *Dict. of Bible.*) Hardly less groundless is the hypothesis that the life of the Christian Church was in any way based on theirs. There are of course points of resemblance enough on the surface to suggest the conjecture: their community of goods, their life of labour and prayer, the religious character given to their daily meals, their purity and temperance, their belief in immortality, their claim to a prophetic power; but these are common to all strivings after a higher life. What has not yet perhaps been adequately brought out is the marked contrast (giving to the latter almost the character of a protest) between their teaching and practice and those of our Lord and His disciples. (1.) They, as a sect (with a partial exception), forbade marriage: He recognized and blessed it. (2.) They forbade the use of oil as a pollution (*B. J.*, ii. 8, § 3): He gave the command, "Anoint thy head" (Matt. vi. 17), and accepted the lavish outpouring of the fragrant ointment on Himself. (3.) They were more rigid even than the Pharisees in their observance of the Sabbath, and the freedom of His teaching must have shocked and startled them in proportion. (4.) They saw a defilement in the inevitable physical conditions of man's daily life (*B. J.*, ii. 8, § 9): He taught that those conditions, and all that belongs to them, "cannot," as such, "defile a man" (Matt. xv. 17). (5.) They bound themselves by an oath to a mysterious secresy as to "the names of the angels" (*B. J.*, ii. 8, § 7); and against the angelolatry which this implied St. Paul enters the strongest possible protest (Col. ii. 18). (6.) If we accept the etymology which connects their name with חָזוֹן, *a vision*, the words in which St. Paul describes the false teachers at Colosse as "intruding into the things which they have or have *not* seen" (I give the alternative readings), may be looked on as a protest against the claim to clairvoyance implied in it.

we have to contemplate the work of the Christ, first as the rabbi, then as the prophet, then as the founder of a kingdom; to trace the variations in the form of His teaching, according to the classes of men with whom He came in contact, and their power of apprehending truth, its gradual expansion, the stages of opposition which it encountered, they (with the exception of the two instances in which the Herodians combine with the Pharisees)[1] vanish out of sight.

[1] The circumstances in each case are worth noticing, and might well claim a place in any list of the *undesigned coincidences* of the Gospel narratives. (1.) We find from John v. 18 that the Pharisee party at Jerusalem had already brought against our Lord the charge of blasphemy as claiming Divine attributes. Luke v. 17 tells us that there were present in the synagogue at Capernaum, almost at the commencement of our Lord's ministry there, "Pharisees and doctors of the law from Judæa *and Jerusalem.*" They bring the same charge again when they hear the words, "Thy sins be forgiven thee." Then, repeating the self-same words which they had heard at Jerusalem, He gives to the paralytic the same command as He had given to the cripple at Bethesda, "Take up thy bed and walk." The same Pharisees are there on another Sabbath, watching whether He will heal on that day there, as He had done in Jerusalem (Luke vi. 7); and after they have been rebuked they take counsel with the Herodians, naturally the influential party in the tetrarchy of Antipas, as if it would be difficult for them to take any active measures there without their concurrence. (2.) The words of our Lord, all but immediately afterwards, contrasting the character of the Baptist with theirs, and referring, as I have said above, to these Herodians, receive a new force if we see in them a protest against the coalition which was then actively at work. (3.) There are no further traces of this combination till we come to the memorable question of the tribute-money. Here St. Matthew (xxii. 16) and St. Mark (xii. 13) tell us that the Herodians were parties to the conspiracy, but it is from St. Luke alone (xxiii. 7) that we learn the fact that made concerted action at that period possible, *sc.*, the presence of Antipas and his followers at Jerusalem. (4.) It is even probable that the special form of outrage selected by the partisans of Herod had in it something of the nature

Our survey of the more prominent schools of Judaism will have shown how little probability there was of the growth among them of a new, purer, universal religion, without some marvellous personal influence to produce it. What did produce the change was, as we have been reminded in words we may well give thanks for,[1] a new type of character, which they could not have imagined,—a new idea of man's religious life, against which they arrayed themselves, for the most part, with a persistent antagonism. The nearest approximation to such a power, the closest parallelism to such a work, is that presented to us by the history of St. Paul; and men may point to that life as a proof that the new type of character did not necessarily imply a Divine origination. He, it may be said, rose out of Judaism into the though of a universal Church, out of ceremonialism into a purer ethical teaching, out of mere morality into the spiritual life. Why was not a like change, a like progress possible, within the conditions of simply human progress, in the life of Jesus? Well, we may admit the resemblance; not only admit, but

of revenge. The "gorgeous robe" was thrust upon the prophet who had rebuked those that were "gorgeously apparelled."

[1] I refer, of course, to *Ecce Homo* generally, and in particular, to the noble passage in pp. 46—49.

proclaim that the whole life of the Apostle, as such, was one continual effort to reproduce the mind and the life of the Master, to be the "follower," the "imitator" of Christ.[1] But then we can point to that history of Saul of Tarsus as being, more than any other, a crucial instance, showing what was so possible and what was not. No enlightenment like that of Hillel, no caution like that of Gamaliel, no knowledge of Greek wisdom or sympathy with Greek thought, would have made him what he was. With all this he would but have hardened and stiffened into a persecuting rabbi. What was needed was that which he described as the revelation of Christ to him and in him.[2] In him the change was brought about, not by slow degrees, but by a great convulsion. He traces all the marvellous transformation to the power of the Lord Jesus. Henceforth he finds in that life, in the words and acts, the death or the resurrection of Christ, the objects of his belief, love, adoration. His work, marvellous as it is, was consciously a copy and reproduction of a more wonderful original.[3] When

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 1. [2] Gal. i. 16.

[3] I need hardly refer to the numerous passages in which this parallelism, I might almost say this identification of the life of the members with that of their Head, is brought out as the law of the Christian life. Comp. Rom. vi. 3, 4, 8—12; 2 Cor. iv. 18; Ephes. ii. 5, 6; 1 Pet. iii. 21; 1 John ii. 6.

we turn to that original, we find no such traces of any influence from without. We can trace its lineaments to no previous model. In the wonderful significance of the names which described His work, in His utter unlikeness, except in the outward form and accidents of His teaching, to all that surrounded Him or was expected of Him; in the unparalleled originality of thought and character; in the power to propagate that thought and character in infinite directions and with infinite variations, while yet the impulse first given has never been wholly lost; in the union of loftiest claims and lowliest life,—in all this, apart even from the miracles of birth, or life, or resurrection, and, therefore, forming part of the evidence of the truth of the history with which they are inseparably interwoven, there is surely enough to suggest the thought of a Divine work. Even those in whom the dogmatism of science is most dominant, or who have fallen most deeply into the despondency of an undogmatic doubt, will admit that if a revelation were possible, this comes nearest, of all that claims that character, to their conception of what it ought to be. Failing this, nothing remains for the thinker but to fall back upon the worship of the Unknown and Unknowable, with whatever ritual it

may clothe itself,[1] and to wait till all other worship has died out and resolved itself into that.

[1] The history of the great prophet of Positivism shows that extremes may meet, and that the wheel of religious life may come full circle, through all phases of denial, to *fetiche* or relic worship. I do not mean to impute to the followers of the school of M. Comte what they may legitimately disclaim as symptomatic of a mind overwrought till it was on the verge of insanity, but the history of the religions of the world shows that it is, for the most part, such outward rites as these that become the popular symbols of a creed, and tell on the feelings and the destinies of millions. I own that it is precisely in this involuntary sympathy with the feelings of mankind which he had previously crushed and scorned, that I feel most interest in M. Comte's life. The disciples who have learned to be above their master have yet to produce a liturgy in which the worship of the Unknowable should be clothed in appropriate form or language, and prayers addressed to the One and the All which neither creates, nor governs, nor reveals itself except through the self-evolving continuity of nature.

V.

THE MIRACLES OF CHRIST.

V.

THE MIRACLES OF CHRIST.

IT might seem natural to pass on at once from the office and titles of the Teacher to His actual work, the truths which He proclaimed, the several stages of antagonism between those truths and the errors which surrounded Him. But here a special question meets us. Mingling with the words of the Teacher we have the record of His acts, and those acts, if they are recorded rightly, have a marvellous and supernatural character. Nothing like them, and those which, as belonging to the same revelation, are more or less closely connected with them, comes within the range of our experience. If history presents many which claim a like character, we have learned to regard the claim in all other instances as groundless.

How are we to regard these? The sceptic, as such, tells us that no human testimony can prove what is against all known human experience. The man who takes his stand on the higher ground of scientific truth, proclaims that the uniformity of the laws of nature is absolute and inviolable; that all phænomena, without exception, must be referred to her self-evolving forces. Even the Theist, recognizing a personal will as the first starting-point of the universe, asserts that it is inconsistent with all true conceptions of the Divine Mind to think of it as needing to supplement original incompleteness by special acts of interference; that that order, of which we can dimly think as having its beginning before the world was, must have been planned to do all that it was meant to do, meeting all contingencies, or, to speak with greater strictness, excluding the possibility of any. All, from their several points of view, agree in looking upon the belief in the supernatural as characteristic of a low stage in the progress of human knowledge, one of the things that must eventually pass away before the triumphant march of Truth.[1]

[1] The most conspicuous manifesto on this side of the question—all the more striking because it is written avowedly (and we have no right to impute the avowal either to hypocrisy or irony) from the ground of a Christian Theism—is, of course, to be found in Professor Baden Powell's essay on the Evidences of Christianity in *Essays and Reviews*.

So it has come to pass that the miracles of the Gospel have assumed a new position in the thoughts and reasonings of those who preach or defend it. When they were first wrought, or the report that they were wrought believed, they were among the elements and conditions of success. They attracted men's wonder, filled them with awe, led them, in varying degrees, to acknowledge the Divine, or at least the supernatural, character of the teaching which they accompanied. For centuries men pointed to the record, assuming its historical character, and appealed to the miracles as signs and tokens of the kingdom of God, the credentials of the mission of the Teacher, proofs that He, as being all that He claimed to be, must have been the Son of God. For centuries also men believed that that supernatural power had not departed from the earth, but that signs and wonders were wrought visibly upon the earth by those whose faith rose to an intensity like that of the first disciples. Then the miracles were the support of the doctrine. Now the Christian apologist has to construct a proof that, taken by themselves, miracles are not impossible, that the doctrine with which they were connected, and the character of Him who claimed the power to work them, gives these miracles a credibility possessed by no others. When that is

accepted, and the miracles accepted for its sake, they may, and doubtless often do, deepen the reverence and awe with which we think of Him by whom all these mighty works were wrought. But most men, arguing with the sceptical or scientific unbeliever, would feel that they cannot now commence their work of persuasion by pointing to the miracles as proofs. The claim to the exercise of like powers is regarded by us now as part and parcel of a system of imposture, or as the outgrowth of a wild fanaticism.

Those who are of little faith, feeble and faint-hearted, may be tempted to wish that they could separate the holiness of the life of Christ, and the wisdom of His teaching, from records which, if they were once aids to faith, seem now to be among the hindrances which have to be surmounted. They would fain strip the Gospel history of its miraculous element, and ascribe it to the imagination and devotion of the disciples, clothing the Teacher whom they loved with this spurious and unreal glory. Lives of Jesus have, we know too well, been written on this basis, lowering all facts that seemed miraculous to the level of ordinary experience, or seeing in them only the mythical adornment of a history which men created out of their own consciousness, assuming even that the Teacher acquiesced slowly and reluc-

tantly in the thaumaturgic expectations of His followers.[1] Stubbornly and obstinately the narratives refuse to be so dealt with. They are not like the lives of Gregory the Wonder-worker, Francis of Assisi, or a thousand others, in which the narratives become more miraculous in proportion as they recede in time from the events which they relate, in which, therefore, it is possible to separate the nucleus of historical fact from the surrounding legends. Here the two are blended inseparably with each other. The most pregnant sayings, the gathering of disciples, the daily life, the expectations of the people, the characteristic incidents which bear on them the stamp of biographical reality, —all these are intertwined with the statement that miracles were wrought, and we cannot disentangle them.[2] We may be thankful, I believe, that

[1] The name of Paulus represents a method of interpretation which we have learned to look on as almost obsolete; but the principle on which it rested still floats loosely in the minds of many, and its influence appears, more or less distinctly, in popular forms of unbelief. The problem being in this case to reconcile the impossibility of miracles with the historical character of the four Gospels, the solution was found in the hypothesis that every narrative of a miracle rested on some ordinary fact, and that the supernatural character ascribed to it was due to the imagination of the writers, or of those from whose evidence they compiled. The other theories referred to are, of course, those of Strauss and Renan. Compare Note B.

[2] The line of proof here referred to has often been set forth; never, perhaps, in a clearer or more interesting form than in the *Scriptural Coincidences* of the late Professor Blunt. Recently it has been stated with some force, though with too limited a range of application, by Mr. Bayne in his *Testimony of Christ to Christianity*.

it is so. It is but a delusive dream to imagine that we should be more successful in combating the unbelief either of the doubting intellect or the unwilling heart, if we could change our position and choose another battle-field than that which God has given us. Do we imagine that we should satisfy the demands of either, if we could present Him whom we adore, as claiming to be *only* the revealer of the mind and will of God, *only* the prophet of a new religion and a sublime morality? Is not the revelation of that Mind the greatest of all miracles, the most stupendous of all interruptions of the uniform succession of causation? Does it not postulate that which historical scepticism and scientific dogmatism alike deny, that God is known in part by us His creatures, and knowable with indefinite expansion of the degrees and clearness of our knowledge, not only through the witness of the beauty and order of the universe, or the intuition of man's moral nature, but by a special act of the Divine Will, withdrawing, here and there, the veil which, in the universe or the mind of man, comes between the soul and God, and disclosing what, without it, would not have been perceived? And the morality and the religion thus proclaimed, do not they speak also of a fatherly care, of a wise and loving government, extending to the lives of

individual men, and of an ultimate retribution, such as the scientific dogmatism of which I speak looks upon as even more difficult of belief, if possible, than the statement that the sick were healed, or sight restored, by a word or touch? Would he who, from the dogma of the invariable succession of phænomena, rejects the one set of alleged facts, be willing to accept the other on the authority of a teacher who appealed only to the heart and conscience of his hearers? Would he not have said, and with more reason, that such an hypothesis needed the test of experiment, that there must be at least some actual manifestation of the Unseen Love or Wisdom before he could believe that it was ordering all things?

I. The grounds on which the antecedent credibility of miracles may be maintained have been often set forth with great power and clearness.[1] It may be worth

[1] I do not know that recent discussions have added much to the pregnant and profound thoughts of the well-known Part II., chap. ii., of the *Analogy of Nature*. Here, as elsewhere, it was Butler's work to compress, without one touch of rhetoric and in a style often heavy and unattractive, what later writers have expanded with more or less power and eloquence. Within the last few years the inquiries of our time have called men to do Butler's work again, and some, at least, of the writers who have dealt with this question are likely to occupy for some time a high place in the ranks of Christian apologists. Mr. Mozley's "Bampton Lectures," on *The Credibility of Miracles*, are perhaps the most exhaustive, as they are also the most Butler-like in their depth and subtlety; but the chapters on Miracles in general, in M. de Pressensé's *Life of Jesus*, and in Mr. Westcott's *Gospel of the Resurrection*, are likely to meet the wants of a larger class, and are every way admirable.

while briefly to recapitulate them. Difficult as it may be to construct a logical proof of Theism which shall not postulate as one of its premisses, the conclusion which it professes to demonstrate, the several lines of proof which are here indicated have a force as addressed to the practical judgment of mankind at large, which should make us hesitate to abandon them in obedience to the *dictum* that the being of God may be assumed but cannot be proved. (1.) In the argument from intuition, we start not merely from the axiom that its witness must be true, but from the experience that in its primary beliefs, those in our own existence and in that of an external world, it has borne the test of time and has not deceived us. (2.) The argument from consent, though less universal, and on that score, therefore, less authoritative than it was once supposed to be, gains an authority of another kind from the fact that the belief in question, though absent, or at least latent, in the conditions in which man's life approximates most closely to that of lower natures, is yet the invariable concomitant of all progress toward knowledge, culture, goodness; and that

Mr. Mansel's essay on "Miracles" in the *Aids to Faith*, and Bishop Fitzgerald's article on the same subject in Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, are interesting, as written, the one from the standpoint of Sir W. Hamilton's philosophy, the other from that of the teaching of Bishop Butler, modified, more in form, perhaps, than substance, by the influence of Archbishop Whately.

wherever man's nature has attained its highest perfection, there the belief in God has been clearest and strongest, and, by men's own confession, the spring and source of all excellence. Cases in which the belief has seemed to retard rather than advance the progress of mankind, to lead them to evil and not to good, are, *pro tanto*, a weight in the other scale; but they, in their turn, serve to show at once how inextinguishable the idea is, and how inadequate for its right development is the knowledge that comes through Nature or through consciousness, without the higher guidance of a direct revelation. (3.) The study of final causes, at one time carried far beyond the limits within which man's researches must be bounded, and based on the assumption that all purposes of the Divine Mind must be discernible by the human, has of late years been regarded, as by an inevitable reaction, with suspicion and something like contempt. Naturalists dwell on morphology, the laws of symmetry, growth, succession, development, and leave teleology, the study of the ends which these subserve, as belonging to an obsolescent stage of science. In due time, it may be, we shall arrive at the truth —not only that the wider and more comprehensive the scale on which the design operates, the greater is the witness which it bears to the

existence of a designing Mind,—but also that there is something approaching to a contradiction in conceding an infinite energy at some infinite remoteness of time, and then denying the possibility of its action, mediate or immediate, through all the infinity that follows. The arguments of Paley's *Natural Theology*, and of a less known, though more elaborate work, MacCulloch's *On the Existence and Attributes of God*, will, with most men, retain their force.

II. (1.) But if by any or all of these elements of proof we are brought to acknowledge God as the Lord and Maker of the universe; if we clothe that Name with all human excellences carried to their highest point, and conceive of Him as yet transcending all,—then, on this assumption, laws of nature are but the expression of His will, self-imposed methods of working, not restraints upon His power. The possibility of a miracle is involved in the recognition of a Divine will. The denial of the one postulates the denial of the other. The infraction of a law, in the sense in which that term is used for a right rule of life and action binding on a will, human or Divine, may be at variance with our conception of perfect excellence; but a *law of nature* is but our expression for uniformity of sequence observed within certain limits, and what we call an interference with or departure from it, is

but the adoption by the Divine Will, beyond those limits, of another mode of working. (2.) If the question is put, as from the grounds of pure Theism, "Does not our intuitive belief in the perfection of Divine wisdom and power lead to the conclusion that the system which is at work, and of which we trace the laws, must be the best conceivable, meeting all necessities, working out His will from first to last?" the answer is, that we see a part and not the whole, and that the order and the seeming departure from it, the law and its suspension, the normal and the abnormal, may be but varying modes of working to one great result, foreseen from the beginning, and stretching through the ages. (3.) Assuming whatever theories of the universe we like,—though we carry back the formation of the Cosmos from the flaming clouds of immeasurable extent to an almost infinite remoteness, or exclude creative acts from the development or the origin of species, or maintain the co-eternity of matter and of force, yet the mind goes on, in its own despite, to some point when an act of will brought the force to bear upon the matter so as to determine all its after evolutions,—when the first monad was quickened into an activity which was to unfold itself afterwards in all the countless forms of organized vitality,—when the nebulous light received

the first impulse that was to issue in the infinite glories of sun and moon and stars. And such a creative act shows that there is a limit to the uniform succession of phænomena. What was possible then remains possible still. Of all conceptions of the Divine nature, that which seems least in harmony with our conceptions of wisdom, power, goodness, is that of a spasmodic, explosive action, giving the universe a start, and then leaving it to itself. (4.) In proportion to the perfection, goodness, and wisdom with which we clothe the thought of God, we are compelled to believe that He would reveal that perfection to the creatures to whom He has given an intellect capable of perceiving, and a heart capable of adoring it. It may be that, for the most part, the witness of the things that are seen, and that of our intuitive belief, lead men to recognize it; but experience shows—the very objection with which we are dealing shows—that mere uniform succession of phænomena tends to obscure the witness. Men become torpid and indifferent, acquiescing, without thought, in what they behold daily, or they make an idol of the succession itself, and do not care to retain God in their knowledge; and so there may be the risk—close, terrible, inevitable—of their ceasing to acknowledge Him, or still more, as the history of heathenism shows, of dark and per-

verted thoughts of what He is and what He wills. Can we conceive any restoration of a true belief, any manifestation of the Divine Will to be possible, except under the condition of some change in the succession both of thoughts and facts? Must not the touch of a Creative Power be felt within and without, in the depths of man's spirit, in the phænomena of the material universe, that men may once again awake from their torpor or denial to the acknowledgment that they have a Father in heaven? (5.) The order of the universe, as it is, shows, in a perpetually ascending scale, the power of forces of a higher character to control and suspend the action of laws which otherwise would act on matter without let or hindrance. Every form of life, vegetable and animal, brings about new mechanical and chemical combinations, holds together what would otherwise be separated, sustains what would otherwise fall. When life passes into the region of intelligence and will, the power is, we see on all sides, indefinitely increased. The will of one man affects the material universe, not only as the volition of an animal may affect it, but to an almost incalculable extent. It may change the face of nature, turn a wilderness into a garden or a garden into a wilderness, control the lightning, modify climate, tame brute beasts, preserve or ex-

tinguish species, restrain the pestilence, prolong life or hasten death, affect the destinies of men for centuries. True it is that man does these things as the "minister et interpres naturæ." He submits that he may command. Patiently he explores the laws of nature, and, having learnt them, works under their guidance, and so exercises a combining and constructive power, which is at least an approximation to a creative energy. But if so, if man be thus an author and originator of effects, the starting-point, within limits, of a breach of continuity in the normal succession of phænomena, may we not reason upwards from the lower to the higher, and claim that power in a yet higher form for the Supreme Intellect and Will? Is it not in strict harmony with the analogy of experience to suppose it possible that one man even may so transcend his fellows in what brings him nearer to the wisdom and the goodness of God, as to receive from Him some portion of His power also?

III. Arguments of this kind tend to remove difficulties. They are answers to *à priori* objections. But the real proof of the miracles of the Gospel narrative is, of course, like that of all other alleged facts, historical in character. We receive them as the result of converging lines of evidence. (1.) We have testimony, which we believe to be enough to prove other facts,

proving them. Men lived in the belief that they had seen the sick healed and the dead raised; and with regard to one Resurrection, lived laborious and painful lives, endured mockings and scourgings, were faithful unto death, in bearing their testimony of it. Far removed as those eye-witnesses are now from us, we have records which were not far removed from the facts of which they tell, and which testify to each other's truth by their manifest independence, their discrepancies, even by their real or seeming contradictions, not less than by their unsought agreement. (2.) The signs and wonders of the Gospels have, at least, the claim on our belief which belongs to a theory that solves phænomena. We ask, How came it that a doctrine and a life, so utterly at variance with later Judaism, rose out of that Judaism and overcame it? How was it able to advance and triumph over the sensual degradation and godlessness of the heathen world? If we point to the energy, devotedness, and zeal of its first preachers, whence came that zeal and energy? What other explanation can be given of all these facts but that which the men themselves gave of it, that they had indeed seen with their eyes and heard with their ears; that these things were not done in a corner; that they had beheld the lame walk, and the blind receive their sight, and that

these facts had made on them an ineffaceable impression? (3.) We point to that very closeness and interdependence of teaching and supernatural work of which I spoke. We cannot separate the one from the other. The Teacher who proclaimed the divinest and noblest law of life, whose life was one long martyrdom to truth, He claimed the power. Could such an one have claimed the power unless He believed that He possessed it? Could there have been the belief without the reality of that possession? Can we, with all our experience of human character, conceive a Cagliostro preaching the Sermon on the Mount, or believe that healer and healed could have cheated themselves into the conviction that a mighty and supernatural work had been wrought by one upon the other?

No; the miracles of the Gospel retain their place and do their work, though that work may vary according to the state of men's minds, and their degrees of knowledge. At first they served the purpose of startling or arresting men's attention. They strengthened a doubting faith; led it to feel that there was a fact outside itself on which it might rest; and that it was not cheating itself with its own dreams and imaginations. They have answered the same end since for millions of souls who have

received the narrative with a like simple and unquestioning trust. They meet the more trained mind of the historical student by supplying the explanation of phænomena which otherwise are startling or perplexing. They show that Christendom was possible, because there was a power at work calling it into being, and bringing about a result which no combination of Semitic and Aryan beliefs, of Jewish and Alexandrian religious thought, would have been able to achieve. They force the inquirer in physical science to ask himself whether Nature is but the veil of Isis, hiding the Unknown and the Unknowable, and never to be lifted, or whether it gives glimpses, through the veil, of the Eternal Power and Godhead, as known in part, and revealing itself in "sundry times and divers manners," according to His own will and men's power to receive the revelation?

IV. The defence of the supernatural element of the Gospel history has, however, had the effect which too often attends all apologies and evidential arguments. It has led men's minds away from the facts themselves. They have ceased to inquire what they actually were, under what laws and conditions they were performed, what purpose they answered at the time, in what relation they stood to other grounds of belief. We cannot rightly pass on to the life

and teaching with which they were so indissolubly connected, without at least attempting to answer these questions.

1. It may be noted, partly as significant in itself, partly as an answer to objections, that there does not appear to have been any strong expectation of thaumaturgic power at the commencement of our Lord's ministry. John had obtained the repute and reverence which belonged to a prophet, and yet he had confessedly wrought no miracle.[1] The first group of disciples who acknowledged Jesus as the Christ did so on the strength of John's testimony, and the Divine grace and power of His own words.[2] In this instance the appetite was created by the food. The mighty works in which He manifested His glory, while they strengthened the faith of the true disciples, created the unhealthy craving which He, whenever it came before Him as such, condemned, mourned over, refused to satisfy.[3] So far, then, we cannot ascribe the report of His signs and wonders to any desire on the part of the evangelists to meet the previous

[1] I do not refer only to the direct statement of the evangelist in John x. 41, but to the entire absence of any trace of a belief that he possessed any other supernatural gift than that which fitted him for a prophet's work. The words of our Lord, too, "Go, and show John again the things which ye do hear and see" (Matt. xi. 4 ; Luke vii. 22), imply that these were things which bore testimony of a higher power and a mightier work than his had been.

[2] John i. 41, 45, 49. [3] John iv. 48 ; Matt. xvi. 3, 4 ; Luke iv. 24.

expectations of the people. He might have been recognized as a prophet—by many, as the Christ—without them.[1] If the people were looking for signs in the Christ to come, they were of a far different nature from those which He wrought, precisely of the kind which He refused. Yet the comparison of His work with that of the Baptist, leads to the conviction that the miracles could not have been dispensed with. Differing as the two did in almost everything, they differed pre-eminently in this, that the one did and the other did *not* work miracles, and to this, as one at least of the causes, we must ascribe the different results of their teaching. The works of healing forced upon the minds of men a conviction of reality which no speech, however strong and mighty, could bring about. They, and the words of grace, interpreted and sustained each other.

2. There is, as has been often noticed, recently with great power and beauty,[2] a striking self-restraint and reserve in our Lord's use of His supernatural power. He works, as it were, under self-imposed

[1] I of course admit the existence of the belief, among the Messianic expectations of the time, that there would be "signs" of some sort accompanying the coming of the Christ (John vii. 30, 31). What I lay stress on is the fact that this belief was neither dominant nor universal enough to explain the wide acceptance of the statement that such signs were wrought, in the absence of an historical foundation for it.

[2] *Ecce Homo*, p. 47.

limitations. The temptation has left behind it that lesson. He may not for Himself command the stones to be made bread, or throw Himself from the pinnacle of the temple,—may not so put forth His power as to make it the pathway to sovereignty or glory.[1] While sympathy with suffering led Him forward to miraculous activity, as though He could not but put forth His power to heal, this led Him to shrink from publicity. Again and again, the constantly recurring sequel to the narrative of a miracle is, He "would have no man know it;" He "commanded that they should hold their peace."[2] After days so spent, when the feverish excitement and enthusiasm of the multitude were at their height, when miracles had done their work, if that were the work they were meant to do, we hear of His retiring to a "solitary place," withdrawing to the mountain, apart from the multitude, apart even from the disciples, alone with God.[3] It is almost humiliating to turn from the thoughts

[1] John vi. 15. The close connexion between this temptation and that in the wilderness, when "all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them," were brought before His vision, lies on the surface. Hardly less striking is that between the words with which the Tempter had been driven back,—"Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God,"— and the words which St. John records, "My Father giveth you the true bread from heaven. . . . I am the living bread which came down from heaven" (John vi. 32, 51).

[2] Matt. ix. 30; Mark i. 34, 44; v. 43.

[3] Mark i. 35; vi. 47; John vi. 15.

which that fact suggests to the lower work of answering gainsayers, but we may pause for a moment to ask what probability there was that a *mythus* rising out of the popular expectation of a thaumaturgic Christ would have preserved, or could have inserted, that feature in His work and character?

3. We too commonly speak of miracles as the credentials of our Lord's divine mission. We think of Him as manifesting Himself as the Christ, and then pointing to signs and wonders as the proofs of His assertion,—working miracles to refute those who rejected Him. It would be truer to the Gospel narrative and to His own teaching to say that He never so worked them, that He hardly ever so appealed to them. He rebukes the temper which demands a sign from Heaven (some special portent over and above His works of healing) as characteristic of an "evil and adulterous generation."[1] He answers the half-patronizing belief which recognized Him as a teacher sent from God, because the signs He wrought showed that God was with Him, with language which implied that the faith, the trust, the loyal devotion which He required must have quite another starting-point than that.[2] With words in which we trace at once sorrow and indignation,

[1] Matt. xvi. 4. [2] John iii. 2, 3.

He says, "Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe."[1] If there was the yet lower depth of seeking Christ only because men "had eaten of the loaves, and were filled,"[2] the appetite for wonders was rebuked with hardly less sternness. He wrought none for Herod, though he desired greatly to see one.[3] He did not appeal to them in His answer to the high priest or Pilate. To believe Him was a nobler and a higher thing than to believe His works.[4] Philip had fallen from his first faith when he needed the reproof, "Or else believe Me for the very works' sake."[5] If He pointed to those works in His answer to the messengers of John,[6] or spoke of them as a "greater witness" than that of the Forerunner,[7] it was as to works of goodness rather than as works of power, witnesses that whatever He did was in harmony with the will of His Father, not the display of supernatural energy for its own sake, or for the glory and the greatness which might be attained by it. From the beginning to the end the miraculous power is drawn out (with one solitary exception, that of the barren fig-tree) by the sight of human suffering, and he relieves it, as by a divine neces-

[1] John iv. 48. [2] John vi. 26. [3] Luke xxiii. 8.
[4] John x. 38. [5] John xiv. 11.
[6] Matt. xi. 4, 5; Luke vii. 22. [7] John v. 36.

sity, from the force of His intense sympathy. As a man of the noblest type of excellence, richly dowered with the world's riches, might "do good by stealth, and blush to find it fame," so was it with Him who, having not the silver and the gold, gave what He had out of the riches of His surpassing goodness. Would a thaumaturgic *mythus*, we may ask again, have clothed itself in that form?

4. We must add further not only that the miracles were not wrought to produce faith, but that in a majority of cases so large as to lead us by a legitimate induction to a law, they presupposed faith as a condition wherever there was consciousness, and therefore the capacity of believing, in those who were their objects, or if not in them, in those who loved them and prayed for them. He could do no mighty works in Nazareth "because of their unbelief."[1] Seeing the faith of the man sick of the palsy and of his bearers, He said to him, "Thy sins are forgiven thee."[2] To the father of the demoniac boy He proclaimed the condition, "If thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that believeth."[3] It was the faith of the Roman centurion[4] and the woman of Canaan,[5] greater than any that he found in Israel, that brought

[1] Matt. xiii. 58. [2] Matt. ix. 2. [3] Mark ix. 23.
[4] Matt. viii. 10; Luke vii. 9. [5] Matt. xv. 28.

those they cared for within the range of His healing power. As afterwards His apostles gazed into a man's face to see whether he had faith to be healed,[1] so we may believe that He, knowing what was in man, read the hearts through the looks and words of those who came to Him, and as by the law of His nature, by self-imposed limits to a power otherwise illimitable, healed or refrained from healing, according as He saw the loving, confiding trust, or the wavering and doubting heart, or the diseased appetite for wonders. The element of faith, which thus preceded what we have too commonly looked upon as its starting-point, might be quickened into life in many ways,—through the testimony of others; through the impression made on the souls of men by every word or look of that transcendent truthfulness and love; through the feeling, when they turned to Him as able to heal, that, if it were not so, He would have told them:—but there it must be, or else the power, whatever might be its nature or extent, was for them inoperative. All outward signs or media employed by Him were, apparently, for this purpose. For the strong, living faith of a few the spoken word was enough.[2] The great mass of those who came needed the laying on of hands, the sense of actual contact

[1] Acts iii. 4; xiv. 9. [2] Matt. viii. 8.

with that life-giving humanity, to bring them into a state of receptivity.[1] Some there were to whom it was enough to touch but the border of His garment.[2] For all these there was the evidence of sight or hearing, the evidence which we feel to be above all others when we come in contact with those in whom the image of Christ is formed with any distinctness. But there were others for whom knowledge was at one entrance quite shut out, who could not see the loving look, nor hear the loving voice, and it is precisely in these cases that we find other media used, as if to supplement the defective sense, and place the sufferer on a level with his fellow-men. These He leads apart from the multitude, He spits upon the ground, He puts His finger on the eye or ear, He bids one wash in the pool of Siloam,[3] that so they might have these tokens that they were in the hands of a man in earnest, loving, pitying, incapable of deceiving. These facts are, of course, instructive in many ways. If we think of the works of healing as subservient to the spiritual education of those for whom they were wrought, or as types and foreshadowings of the greater works that were to be done afterwards

[1] Mark vi. 5. [2] Mark v. 27; vi. 56.

[3] Compare the healings at Bethsaida (Mark viii. 23), in Jerusalem (John ix. 6), in Decapolis (Mark vii. 33).

on the spirits of men, they are harmonious, intelligible, clothed with a divine beauty and completeness. At present I point to them as incompatible with the theory that the narrative which gives them is a mythical aftergrowth of the actual life. These signs and wonders are not framed after the pattern of those of the prophets of the older covenant. No such features are found, except in distorted shape, and where derivation is clearly traceable, in the marvels of apocryphal gospels or ecclesiastical legends.

5. Other facts connected with the miracles of the Gospel are hardly less suggestive. The power by which they are wrought appears as derived rather than inherent. Not as in possession of the glory of which He had indeed "emptied Himself," [1] not as in the energy of Divine Omnipotence, but as the Son of Man, by His own faith in God, by the power of the Divine Spirit that abode with Him "not by measure," but in its fulness, does He cast out devils and cure diseases. In this as in other things, He is as the "firstfruits," the great pattern of a perfect humanity, which His followers were to reproduce afterwards in different measures and degrees. The one uttered thanksgiving at the grave of Lazarus,[2] as of one who

[1] Phil. ii. 7. [2] John xi. 42.

knew that his Father heard Him always, indicates the law that was at work in other instances. And the power which thus resided in His human nature because the Father was in Him, brought with it a strain upon the strength and endurance of that nature, and needed to be sustained by ever-renewed communion in the prayer of solitude. So when the woman's touch fell upon the hem of His garment, there was the consciousness as of a power, a "virtue," going forth from Him.[1] He did not heal without some participation, through His intense sympathy, in the sufferings of those who came to Him, for "Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses."[2] After the evening hours spent in healing, He needed to withdraw, in the darkness of the night, to a solitary place, and seek strength and rest in prayer.[3] After the feeding of the five thousand He "went up into a mountain apart to pray."[4] Even when He speaks of the signs and wonders from which He deliberately drew back as inconsistent with His character and work, it is implied that these too were dependent, as others were, on prayer, and the answer to prayer,—"Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and He

[1] Mark v. 30.
[2] Matt. viii. 17.
[3] Mark i. 35.
[4] Matt. xiv. 23.

will presently give Me twelve legions of angels?"[1] All these hints are, it is obvious, infinitely significant, but their significance is that of facts which might easily be passed over altogether, beyond the creative power of the appetite for the marvellous, seeking to satisfy itself.

V. One class of miracles occupies a distinct position, and has suggested questions and difficulties peculiar to itself. What explanation are we to give of those works which restored not bodily but mental health, and in which we have not only a victory over the disease, but a special theory as to its origin and nature solemnly sanctioned by the Healer? Were the demoniacs of the New Testament really under the possession of unclean spirits? Are we to think of that power of evil as peculiar to that time and country, permitted to manifest itself with a more terrible distinctness because it was to be met and mastered by a yet mightier manifestation of good? Or are we to see in them only those whom we should classify as insane, cataleptic, hysterical, whose disorders we should attribute to a brain stimulated or atrophied, or nervous tissues wrought to undue excitement? And if so, are we to see in the language of the narrators of the work of healing, and in that of

[1] Matt. xxvi. 53.

the Divine Healer, an adoption, real or simulated,[1] of a popular theory of disease which we should term, from our more scientific point of view, a popular superstition? Or, lastly, have we any grounds for believing the theory itself to have been true then, and to be true still, giving the explanation of phænomena which at present baffle all scientific theories of causation? Any true answer to these questions must start from the recognition of facts. And those which chiefly bear upon them stand thus. (1.) The phænomena of demoniacal possession are, beyond all question, identical with those of the more incurable and terrible forms of madness. The divided consciousness, the intolerance of clothing, the preternatural strength, the cataleptic rigidity, the mania homicidal and suicidal, the loathing of human society, the dumbness which is not organic, but has its root in a diseased will, the violent convulsions,—all these have been noted in a thousand instances by students of mental pathology.[2]

[1] It is idle to ignore the fact that we have more than the reflection, in the language of the evangelists, of the popular theory. They shared it themselves. Unless we choose the alternative of supposing a deliberate simulation of belief, where the belief, if not true, must have been mischievous as well as false, we must add that it was shared also by their Master. If it were so shared, we have to choose again between the hypothesis of a limitation of His knowledge within the limits which bounded that of others of His time and country, and that of the belief being true. The words, which show what He taught or implied, are clear enough.

[2] The Gadarene demoniac is, of course, the typical representative of

(2.) Some of the facts which seem at first to imply a recognition by our Lord of the presence of an evil personality are, it must be admitted, common to these and to other works of healing. If He "rebuked" the unclean spirit, He also "rebuked," in Peter's house, the fever,[1] and on the Sea of Galilee "rebuked" the winds and waves.[2] (3.) Other facts are, however, irreconcileable (unless we reject the narratives altogether) with any conclusion but that which recognizes a spiritual and not a physical origin for the disordered mind and will. The cry of the demons, speaking through the man, craving that they may enter into the swine, instead of being sent to the abyss;[3] their confession, in the very earliest stage of our Lord's ministry, when disciples were hesi-

the class. "No man could bind him, no, not with chains." He loathed human fellowship, and had "his dwelling among the tombs." He was ever "crying and cutting himself with stones;" "exceeding fierce, so that no man might pass by that way." He "wore no clothes" (Luke viii. 27). He at first identifies himself with the "legion" that possessed him. He recognizes Jesus as the Son of the Most High God (Matt. viii. 29; Mark v. 2—9). In the case of the demoniac child who was healed immediately after the Transfiguration, the phænomena have more of an epileptic character. He "wallowed foaming." The spirit ofttimes "cast him into the fire and the water to destroy him." It "rent him sore." It was a "dumb spirit," and "wheresoever he taketh him, he teareth him; and he foameth, and gnasheth with his teeth, and pineth away" (Matt. xvii. 15; Mark ix. 17—22; Luke ix. 39.

[1] Luke iv. 39. [2] Matt. viii. 26; Mark iv. 39; Luke viii. 24.

[3] Not the "deep" of the Galilæan lake, but the "bottomless pit" of the apocalyptic vision (Luke viii. 31; Rev. ix. 1; xvii. 8; xx. 1).

tating in their faith, that they stood in the presence of the Holy One of God, the Son of the Most High God,[1] — these point to a discernment which, if in part communicated to the consciousness of the man, was yet the result of the contact of that consciousness with a power of superhuman intelligence. (4.) There is the striking and suggestive fact that the modern treatment of identical or analogous cases is successful in proportion as it approximates to that of which the Gospels present the great archetypal instance. Restraint, violence, coercion, — these fail now, as the chains and fetters failed with the Gadarene. The treatment which wins its way, though it may use therapeutic agencies, is predominantly spiritual. Mightier than all poppies and mandragora is the power of a strong will over a diseased one, of kindness over ferocity, of look and tone as the expression of both ; a power, *i.e.*, like that which, in its more intense forms, depends on "prayer and fasting" as conditions; which, in its weaker forms, requires at least "faith," confidence in the power of steadfast will to control even the most ferocious paroxysms.[2]

[1] Mark i. 24 ; Luke iv. 33.

[2] Mark ix. 29 ; Matt. xvii. 20. The successful exorcisms of the disciples of the Pharisees (and our Lord's words in Matt. xii. 27 imply a measure of success) may legitimately be ascribed to the fulfilment of these conditions by the truer and more earnest members of their class.

Historically, those who have done most to improve the treatment of the insane have acted consciously, or unconsciously, in the spirit of their Master, and reproduced, with whatever feebleness and imperfections, His example. The very exorcists of the early Churches did not confine themselves[1] to solitary acts, did not think of their work as one to be accomplished by spells and charms only, nor even by prayer alone, but brought to bear the slower process of discipline and kindness. As we legitimately point to hospitals as one of the fruits of that sympathy with suffering to which the work of Christ, as shown in His miracles of healing, gave an impulse altogether new, so we may also point to asylums for the insane as results, hardly more remote, of His treatment of the demoniacs. (5.) As the phænomena of those demoniacs are to a large extent identical with what has been observed elsewhere, and at other times, so there is not, from first to last, a single phrase in the New Testament records, indicating that they were looked on as peculiar to any given time or place. Possession takes its place, without a special distinction, among the common sufferings of humanity, side by side with blindness, lameness, deafness, leprosy.

[1] Comp. Bingham, *Eccles. Antiq.*, iii. 4, § 7.

The conclusions to which these facts lead us are, perhaps, better suggested in the form of questions than formulated into dogmas. Must we not ask ourselves whether, after all, our theory of causation, as regards these phænomena, even approximates to completeness? In the absence of any adequate physical causes, with the facts that the disease is in the will and consciousness, and that all remedial agency consists in bringing that diseased will under the influence of another, at once healthy and benignant, would not the theory of a spiritual force, disturbing and deranging, but itself liable to be overcome by a power of like nature, restoring and establishing, if not stating the *vera causa*, at least solve most or all of the phænomena? Can we, in our ignorance of the actual or possible forces of the universe, deny that the supposed cause may be *vera?* As men recognize in the existence of evil,—in their own personal experience of its power,—in their feeling that it is not identical with their true self, but an enemy to be resisted and cast out,—tokens of the personality of the Tempter; as without the assumption of that personality the whole teaching of Christ is based as on a sick man's dream; so here, also, our own experience may be admitted as testifying to the possible action of one will upon another, of spiritual as well as physical forces at work

upon the spirits of men.[1] If the belief of the evangelists were but a popular conjecture, was the guess altogether wrong? If it was incorporated into a system which has revealed the Divine will and been a world-wide blessing; if it explains phænomena, and reconciles seeming contradictions; if it leads, not to cruelty and superstition, but to enlightenment, wisdom, mercy,—does it not possess at least some claims to be received as probable? Should the assumption that it must be false stand in our way of recognizing what we should otherwise receive as true?

[1] In this, as in the cognate belief in the ministry of angels, there is the risk of the truth which we see dimly and in part, becoming the nucleus of a monstrous aftergrowth of error. On the one side men have plunged into a bewildering demonology; on the other they have been tempted to angelolatry. It is easy enough to sweep both beliefs away as incompatible with science and incapable of proof, and to take up with the creed of those who, as they deny that there is any resurrection, deny also that there is "angel or spirit:" but unless we are Sadducean throughout, unless we make man's spiritual being but a function of his organic life, perishing when that perishes, we must at least admit the possibility of other spiritual existences capable of acting upon his for good and evil. Have we so classed and catalogued all the forces of the universe, as to prevent our seeing, in the demoniac powers of the Gospel history, tokens of a region unexplored, of which we gain but partial glimpses, but which is yet more than the cloudland of a dreamer?

VI.

THE WORK AND TEACHING OF CHRIST.

VI.

THE WORK AND TEACHING OF CHRIST.

AS the greatness of the work and life of which the Gospels record the history may be, in part, measured (I speak after the manner of men) by the immense extent and duration of its influence, so, in part also, may we judge of it by the variety of answers which men return to the questions, What was it? What did Christ come into the world to do? What was the end and purpose of His life? From many thousands whom we must look upon as His truest followers the answer comes,—"He came to save sinners." His work as a teacher becomes altogether subordinate. They fix their thoughts not on the words but on the acts, and nearly all acts drop into the background as compared with the death by which sinners were redeemed. The

Cross of Christ, rather than His words or works, is the subject-matter of their preaching. There are others, on whom these would oftentimes pass a harsh judgment, to whom that aspect of His work presents many hard and dark questions, who turn away from all thoughts of the atonement and the ransom as rooted in the misconceptions of His followers, and are content to see in Him only the pattern of a stainless life, the preacher of a sublime morality. The Sermon on the Mount, and the Parables which reproduce its chief lessons, are for them the sum and substance of the whole Gospel. Standing by themselves, or blending in different degrees with one or other of these broad divisions, are many individual thinkers, who, having read the history with an earnest desire to enter into its meaning, have received other impressions as to the character and purpose of Him of whom it tells. To some He has seemed but as a Reformer, the type and pattern of all other reformers,[1] warring against the

[1] The typical phrase of Camille Desmoulins, "Jésus Christ, le bon Sans-culotte," expresses this feeling in its extreme form, but it has manifested itself more or less in all movements against the evils of despotism, feudalism, plutocracy, from the thirteenth century downwards. It is as prominent in Wycliffe and Tyndale as it was in the earlier writings of Mr. Kingsley. Often, of course, it mingled, in different degrees, with the other feeling, which showed its strength or weakness not so much in action against the world's order as in separation from it.

sins of a corrupt priesthood, against the luxury and selfishness of the rich, against the traditions of an elaborate and subtle casuistry; to some, again, (who that remembers the history of St. Francis of Assisi can ignore the power or truth of that impression?) as the friend of the poor, the preacher and pattern of an unworldly life, calling men to a voluntary poverty. Others, again, have recognized the influence of the Old Testament prophecies as determining His purpose and His acts. He aimed, so it has been said, at re-establishing the Theocracy; at restoring the kingdom to Israel, and making it universal; at founding a visible society, with a polity and ordinances of its own, to be through all the world what Israel had been within its own narrower sphere; at levelling all distinctions between Jew and Gentile, all special sacredness of holy places, and proclaiming a universal brotherhood and a universal worship; at spreading far and wide, by teaching and life, what has been termed, in language all the more pregnant and suggestive because it is in some degree indefinite, "the enthusiasm of humanity."[1]

[1] *Ecce Homo*, ch. xiv. Some have found fault with the phrase as having no authority in the recorded language of our Lord or His apostles. Most readers will have felt that this is one of those instances in which a word, singularly felicitous, comes from the mint of a strong mind, to take its place among the current coin of thought, adding to our moral wealth, and as such, will have welcomed it. What other phrase could so well express the

All these answers come from those who in varying degrees worship, believe, admire. Others there are, uttered in harsher accents, the echoes heard here and there even now, as they have been heard before in the third,[1] the thirteenth,[2] the eighteenth[3] centuries, of the old revilings of which the Gospels tell us, —"He casteth out devils by Beelzebub;" "He deceiveth the people." These I need hardly speak of here. We do not need (thank God for that) to answer such revilings when we are dealing with the

transfigured and glorified utterance of the old "*Homo sum, humani nihil a me alienum puto,*" which we find in Matt. xxv. 40, 45? What other describes half so well the extent of philanthropy which showed itself in the life and the language of St. Paul?

[1] Celsus, after the fashion of some later writers, adopts the artifice of putting his most offensive language in the lips of an imaginary Jew. It is probable enough that he did repeat the language of the Alexandrian Jews of his time, and so we find in him the first traces of the foul slanders afterwards embodied in the *Sepher Toldoth Jesu.* In his treatment of the Gospel narrative of the Resurrection he anticipates Renan.

[2] The tradition which ascribed the saying or the book, *De tribus impostoribus,* to the Emperor Frederick may be very doubtful, nor does it seem quite clear that any work bearing that title ever existed; but the prominence of the tradition in the thirteenth century shows how great an alarm had been created, and how much men's minds had been unsettled by contact with Jews whose faith was little more than that of Deists, and Mahometans who were passing into Pantheism.

[3] In the eighteenth century Voltaire, and yet more Rainarus and Lessing, are the typical representatives of this form of unbelief. On the question whether this is the explanation of the well-known "Ecrasez l'infame" it may be well to give the accused the benefit of the doubt. In Paine we have the same feeling, uttering itself not in the sarcasm of the *salon,* but with the coarseness of the beer-shop.

great mass of floating doubt and partial unbelief around us. If there be darkened souls that can bring themselves to utter such things now, let us leave them to His judgment and compassion against whom they speak;

"Non ragioniam di lor, ma guarda e passa."

The sense of incompleteness which most of us feel, as we think over any one of these aspects of our Lord's work and teaching, warns us against the peril of a like inadequacy in any survey of our own. If I do not draw back from the attempt to collect and arrange the materials for such a survey, it is not that I am unmindful of that danger. There is in all He taught and did, a length and breadth and depth and height which transcend our measurements. We seek to know that which passeth knowledge. "We "know in part," we see "through a glass darkly." But the attempt is, I believe, worth making. It may help us to a clearer apprehension of the meaning of the Divine words, and of the impression which they made on those who heard them. We may learn to trace their echoes in the teaching of the Apostolic Church; to see, in the progressive development of truth under the guidance of the Spirit of Christ, the expansion of what, in His discourses, had been given in germ. His words were not merely true;

they were living seeds of truth, destined to bud, and grow, and bring forth fruit, according to the soil on which they fell, "some thirtyfold, and some sixty, and some a hundredfold."

We must bear in mind, as we enter on the inquiry, that what is recorded forms but a small portion of the actual teaching. Discourses in the open country, as full and explicit as the Sermon on the Mount; discourses in every synagogue of Galilee, as memorable as those at Nazareth or Capernaum; interviews with Scribes like those with Nicodemus; disputings and conflicts in the very courts and porches of the Temple, like those a few of which have been preserved for us by St. John; the daily intercourse with the Twelve, educating them to be scribes of the kingdom; parables scattered broadcast to the multitude, and explained in private to the disciples; a thousand answers to the questions of eager converts or doubting scribes,—all this we must take into account if we seek to form a true estimate of what the teaching was, and of the creed of Christendom as growing out of it. The words of the beloved disciple[1] testify to the overpowering fulness of his recollections of that teaching. "Were the things which Jesus did" (we may surely apply the words,

[1] John xxi. 25.

even *à fortiori*, to what He said) "to be written every one, the world itself would not contain the books that should be written."

I. If any one phase of our Lord's teaching can claim priority over others, it may well be that to which He himself gave prominence when He stood before Pilate, and in solemn words proclaimed the purpose of His life,—"To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness to the truth."[1] As the death, whatever else it was, was also the highest of all martyrdoms, so the life, too, from first to last, in word and act, had been a testimony to the truth. There was the fullest assertion possible at once of truth, the truth of God, as something that could be revealed to man, and of His own power and purpose to reveal it. Standing before the Roman Procurator ready to ask, in his rough or melancholy scepticism, "What is truth?" He can proclaim what the experience of that age, and of all ages since, has verified, "Every one that is of the truth heareth My voice." This is His answer to Pilate's wondering question, "Art thou a king, then?" This was His manifestation of the kingly office to which God had called Him. The Roman dreamt of a kingdom maintained by armies, intrigues,

[1] John xviii. 37.

conspiracies; He found it in "bearing witness" to the truth. In the allegiance of those who received that witness He recognized His true sovereignty. That was an account which even to the doubting heathen would be at least intelligible.

The echoes of this utterance in St. John's Epistles are distinct enough. There, also, the words "testimony," "witness," "record," are as the ever-recurring keynotes of the whole.[1] The name on which he rests is that of "Him who is true,"[2] essentially, transcendently true—the "faithful and true witness."[3] His Lord and Master is for him so identified with the truth, that the latter ceases to be an abstract thought, is always more than a complex system. It becomes living and personal. He writes to those who have known the Truth as they have known the Life; as something which they have seen with their eyes and which their hands have handled.[4] The Truth dwells in them, and shall be with them for ever. But it is, perhaps, more worthy of note, that it is

[1] The word μαρτυρία and its cognates occur in the whole of the New Testament 152 times. Of these 31 are found in our Lord's recorded teaching (26 in St. John, and 5 in the other Gospels), and 58 in the language of St. John himself. The caprice of our translators in using "record," "witness," "testimony" at random hinders our recognizing the ever-recurring keynote. The passages in which the "tabernacle of *witness*" is mentioned have not been included in this statement.

[2] 1 John v. 20. [3] Rev. iii. 14. [4] 1 John i. 1.

to this record of St. John's Gospel that St. Paul refers as to something already well known to the Asiatic Churches, and therefore to his own disciple Timotheus. Calling him also to fight the good fight of faith, he does so as giving him a special charge "in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and before Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed the good confession."[1] This new devotion to Truth as a thing to live and die for,—the spirit of martyrdom which we rightly honour, however dim and obscure men's notions of the truth for which they died have been,—this enthusiasm of belief, which stands out in such broad contrast with the scepticism of that age, and of our own, and in which was the secret of the Church's victory over the world,—this refusal to have any compact or confederacy with falsehood,—this, which the Christian Church has so often forgotten, but which, in proportion as she has attained to it, has given her strength and health,—this must be noted as

[1] 1 Tim. vi. 13. Those who admit the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles can hardly over-estimate the value of this undesigned coincidence with the narrative of St. John's Gospel. The other evangelists make no mention of any "confession" before Pilate, beyond the simple "Thou sayest it." The words of St. Paul can hardly point to anything else as "*the* good confession" than that recorded by St. John. I need hardly say, that I do not assume the existence of his Gospel as a book at the time when St. Paul wrote. To some, of course, this argument may seem an argument for the later date of the Epistles. This is not the place to discuss this question, but I may refer to an examination of Baur's objections in articles on Timothy, and the Epistles to him, in the *Dictionary of the Bible.*

first in all our thoughts of the work of Christ, as explaining all other thoughts.

II. But for this very reason, the question what the truth was for which He came into the world, becomes infinitely important. In other teachers we may reverence the pursuit of truth almost irrespectively of its attainment. Here we believe that we have the truth itself revealed in all its fulness. And of all special truths which He proclaims, that which is most prominent from first to last,—which uttered itself in His first proclamation, while He and the Baptist were working as yet together, — which entered into the witness before Pilate, — was the proclamation of a kingdom of God, a kingdom of heaven, a kingdom not of this world. The term was familiar enough to Jewish minds in their speculations as to the Messiah.[1] The idea was in-

[1] With what thoughts the words were connected, what points of resemblance and contrast those thoughts presented to the teaching of our Lord, may be seen in the language of the rabbis of that, or of a later date. (1) As connected with the work of the Baptist as the "voice crying in the wilderness," it is interesting to note the *Chaldee Paraphrase* of Isaiah xl. 9, "Say unto the cities of Judah, The kingdom of your God is revealed." (2) There are traces of another meaning than that of earthly state and splendour. When a man recites the Creed of Israel (Deut. vi. 4), he "takes the kingdom of heaven into himself" (*Bab. Gem.*, fol. 15). "'The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom;' —this is the kingdom of heaven" (Zohar. *in Levit.*, fol. 53). (3) The Paraphrase of Isaiah liii. 11, "They shall see the kingdom of their Messiah," would seem to show that there were some to whom the thought of a suffering Christ had, at least, suggested itself, little as it found acceptance with the great mass of priests and people (Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* on Matt. iii.)

volved in the very claim to be the Christ, the son of David. But how infinite the distance between their dreams and what He actually taught! Often as men have dwelt on that contrast, till it has become almost one of the "purple patches" of apologists, we yet fail, for the most part, to recognize its magnitude and to trace the thousand ways in which it showed itself. It was "near," "at hand," "in the midst of men;" and therefore men were called, not to courage and conquest, but to repentance. The King made himself known not to multitudes, armies, the leaders of the intellectual life of Israel, but here and there to a few peasants, a blind beggar, a Samaritan adulteress. He would have men find Him out, be drawn to Him by His loving words, and the Divine purity of His life, rather than proclaim Himself. And the kingdom which He came to found, though it starts from the idea of Israel, is universal. "Many shall come from the east and from the west, and sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven."[1] He is to sit upon His throne and judge all the *heathen*.[2] His apostles are to make disciples of all

[1] Matt. viii. 11.

[2] Matt. xxv. 32. Our failure to recognize the true meaning of the word here obscures the thought that the law of judgment here proclaimed is specially that by which they are tried who have *not* known the truth as revealed in Christ, who have *unconsciously* worked or failed to work in His service.

those heathen nations.[1] And it is no ideal polity that He comes to found, such as dreamers have imagined for themselves. It is an actual society of living men, with their sins, infirmities, hypocrisies. The tares are mingled with the wheat; and the net takes in fish bad and good; and of the servants of the king, one at least is wicked and slothful; and of the virgins who expect the bridegroom, five are foolish. It has its outward tokens of citizenship, but the true blessedness of its citizens is attained only by those who submit to its laws and enter into its life. But over the obedient and rebellious alike, the true-hearted and the hypocrites, He asserts His sovereignty. All judgment is His. All power is given to Him in heaven and in earth. He must reign till His enemies are made His footstool.

III. But with this claim to a sovereignty absolutely unlimited, there is, from the very first, the clearest announcement, and therefore the clearest perception, that the path to it was through death, and that it lay beyond the grave. His teaching as to the kingdom had no meaning if it was not, from the very first, prophetic, though His disciples knew it not, of His death and resurrection. The rash eagerness of the multitude who would have

[1] Matt. xxviii. 19.

made Him a king He simply slips away from.[1] His first act afterwards is to speak so as to repel those who came to him with sensuous and ambitious dreams.[2] When the mass of disciples swelled day by day, and would fain carry Him in triumph into the Holy City, amid their shouts of Hosannas and waving palm branches, there is something almost of the nature of a sad and earnest irony in the pageant which He appoints. If, on the one hand, that strange procession, the King riding not in his stately chariot, but on an ass's colt, was a deliberate fulfilment of a prophecy, yet the prophecy itself was, as it were, chosen for fulfilment, because it bore witness that the kingdom was one of peace, not war,—of submission, not conquest. Nothing but His will was wanting. One sign, one word, and that multitude would have gathered round Him and fought to the death; one word of prayer (so He taught) and "His Father would have presently given Him twelve legions of angels."[3] But that word He would not speak, that prayer He would not offer. He had resisted that thought in the struggle with the Tempter.[4] When it presented itself in the disguise of Peter's rough devotion, "Be it far

[1] John vi. 15. [2] John vi. 60. [3] Matt. xxvi. 53.
[4] Matt. iv. 8—10; Luke iv. 5, 6.

from thee, Lord," He met it by saying, even to the chief of the apostles, "Get thee behind me, Satan."[1] In the writings of the prophets He had seen, what others saw not, that the path to the Divine kingdom was through death, and from the very first He indicated that it was so. It was no afterthought to console His disciples for His seeming failure. At the very commencement of His ministry He uttered the mysterious words, "Destroy this temple"—the temple of His body—"and in three days I will raise it up."[2] In His first conversation with the representative of the better phase of Phariseeism He taught that "as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so also must the Son of Man be lifted up."[3] Before any specific predictions of His death, he had told His disciples that they must take up their cross and follow Him.[4] The procession to which He called them was like that which the Galilæan peasants had often witnessed, when robbers and outlaws were led to their execution. He lived, long before the words were actually spoken, in the belief that "the corn of wheat must fall into the ground and die."[5]

IV. Nor can we refuse, on any fair method of interpretation, to recognize that the belief which the

[1] Matt. xvi. 22, 23. [2] John ii. 19. [3] John iii. 14.
[4] Matt. x. 38; xvi. 24. [5] John xii. 24.

Christian Church has held as to that death, as being mediatorial, atoning, propitiatory, was much more than an afterthought suggested by the event, and seeking to explain it. From the first, the death which He looked forward to and spoke of was more than that of the martyr; was something quite other than that of the patriot or the warrior. His language, to speak after the manner of men, was that of one whose whole soul was permeated with the idea of sacrifice. As interpreted by the current traditions of the schools of Palestine, that reference to the serpent lifted up could suggest no other thought than that of one who, identifying himself with sin, bore the penalty of death, and so became the source of life and healing to Israel and to mankind.[1] As though the truth which was thus made known to the Rabbi in that midnight interview was as the deep fountain of all words and acts throughout His whole life, we find it ever and anon welling forth, not so much in set and formal teaching, as in utterances of pregnant meaning called forth by seemingly casual occasions. The dis-

[1] Compare the language of the Targum of Jonathan in paraphrasing Numb. xxi. 8, "He shall be healed if he direct his heart unto the Name of the Word of the Lord." So in Wisd. xvi. 6, 7, the serpent is "a symbol of salvation." In the commentary of a later Rabbi (ben-Nachman) there is an almost verbal echo of the Christian view that it symbolized the truth that the same nature which had worked the evil was to be instrumental in healing it. See also the article "Serpent, Brazen," in the *Dictionary of the Bible.*

ciples dispute which should be the greatest, and He rebukes them with the truth that the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to "give His life a ransom for many," in the place of many.[1] The multitude throng round Him that they may eat of the loaves, and He tells them of the "flesh" and of the "blood" which "He will give for the life of the world," which "are meat indeed and drink indeed."[2] As the good Shepherd He giveth His life for the sheep, and gives it as by an act of free, spontaneous will.[3] That "lifting up" is the condition of His "drawing all men unto Him," partly, indeed, as with the cords of a man, through the marvellous attraction of His patience, meekness, agony; but partly, also, as with the cords of an everlasting love, and the power of a Divine act.[4] From the first He had proclaimed the forgiveness of sins as the great work which He came on earth to accomplish; had wrought signs and wonders to bear witness that He had power to forgive them;[5] but as the hour of His death drew nigh, He declared that His blood was "shed for many," *i. e.*, for all men, "for the remission of their sins."[6] As Moses had sprinkled the blood of the victims upon the people, baptizing them, as it

[1] Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45. [2] John vi. 51, 55. [3] John x. 11.
[4] John xii. 32. [5] Matt. ix. 5; Mark ii. 7; Luke v. 23; vii. 48.
[6] Matt. xxvi. 28.

were, into the covenant of Sinai, so His blood was to be the sign and token of a new covenant, making the first old; differing from the first in pointing not to a law written on tables of stone or the pages of a book, but to one written on the tables of men's hearts; but, like that, resting on the idea of sacrifice.[1] If we interpret the life of Christ by His own words we cannot reduce Him to the level of a legislator, or a teacher, or a reformer, or the restorer of a theocracy. The idea of sacrifice is latent or patent throughout His whole work. The teaching of St. Paul and St. Peter, of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and of the beloved disciple, is but the natural development of His.[2]

V. And in this teaching He was but proclaiming part of a true theology. He came to reveal and declare Him whom no man had seen at any time,

[1] In the "New Covenant" of Matt. xxvi. 28 there is a manifest reference, on the one hand, to that of which Jeremiah had spoken (xxxi. 31—34), and to the "blood of the covenant" with which Moses had sprinkled the people when they pledged themselves to obedience (Exod. xxiv. 6—8).

[2] The *consensus* of men representing, as all deeper study of the New Testament shows that they did represent, different phases of Christian doctrine, makes this testimony of a far higher value than a mere aggregation of texts from writers who stood on the same level and saw truth from the same point of view. Thus, to give only a fragment of the evidence, St. Paul teaches that "we are reconciled by the death of Christ," that "He died for the ungodly," and that we are "justified by His blood" (Rom. v. 6—10); St. Peter, that we are redeemed "not with corruptible things, . . . but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot" (1 Pet. i. 18, 19); St. John, that He is "the propitiation for the sins of the whole world," and that His blood "cleanseth us from all sin" (1 John ii. 2; i. 7). In the

but whom He, the only begotten, had both seen and known.[1] In this work of forgiving sins, in this atoning sacrifice, He was doing nothing of Himself, yielding Himself freely to do His Father's will. To reveal that Father, to bear witness to the truth concerning Him—it was for this end that He had come into the world, and lived, and died.[2] He proclaimed the Fatherhood of God as embracing all that men admire and love in human fatherhood, wide-spread over the evil and the good,[3] manifesting itself in the fulness of its love, in proportion as men were willing to submit themselves to it, and to accept the sonship to which He called them. In that belief they might see, in all the chances and changes of life, the guidance of a Father's hand.[4] He was ready to give good things, even the best and highest gift, His Holy Spirit, to them that asked Him.[5]

And here, also, the creed of the Church sprang out of the teaching of its Founder. If, on the one hand, He placed Himself as on the same grounds with

Epistle to the Hebrews the thought is dominant throughout. It is hardly less so in the Apocalypse, where the central figure is that of "a Lamb as it had been slain" (Rev. v. 6); and the elders praise Him as one who "had redeemed them by His blood" (v. 9); and the multitude of saints with palms in their hands have "made their robes white in the blood of the Lamb" (vii. 14).

[1] John i. 18; iii. 32; v. 19. [2] John xvii. 26; xviii. 37.
[3] Matt. v. 45; vii. 11. [4] Matt. vi. 32. [5] Luke xi. 13.

them, and spoke of His Father and their Father, His God and their God,[1] He yet no less clearly claimed for Himself a relationship transcending theirs, involving, in the minds of those who heard Him, enemies and disciples alike, oneness of nature and of might.[2] He was *the* "Son of God," the "only begotten," the "well-beloved."[3] His words, if He were no more than saint or prophet, might well make us shudder as men shuddered then. "I and My Father are One." "The glory which I had with Thee before the world was." "Before Abraham was, I am:"[4]—these spoke of a Fatherhood and a Sonship within the Divine essence itself. As the archetype of all fatherly rule and love was found in the Godhead, so also was that of all filial reverence and obedience. "The Son can do nothing of Himself, but what He seeth the Father do; for what things soever the Father doeth, these doeth the Son likewise."[5]

And so also of that other Name which is the witness of yet another personality within the Divine unity. At first His words convey the thought of a power, a gift, an influence, given in its fulness to Himself, but bestowed freely on all who asked for it.[6]

[1] The words of John xx. 17 did but bring together the "My Father" and the "your Father," which had been throughout the burden of His teaching.

[2] John v. 17, 31. [3] John iii. 16—18.

[4] John x. 30; xvii. 5; viii. 58. [5] John v. 19. [6] Luke xi. 13.

The Spirit guides and prompts His own acts, speaks through His lips, gives His human nature power over the spirits of evil.[1] But here, too, the more transcendent meaning soon begins to manifest itself. Men may blaspheme against that Holy Spirit as they blasphemed against the Father and the Son.[2] The name which has described all that was most personal in the Son of Man, as the friend, counsellor, consoler of His disciples, pleading for them and with them, is transferred to the Spirit, and He is promised to them as another Comforter, another Paraclete, working in the hearts of men everywhere and throughout the ages, what He, the Son, had wrought by loving voice and look in the hearts of the Twelve.[3] He proceeds from the Father, and yet the Son sends Him.[4] He carries on the work which the Son began on earth, guides men into all the truth, reproves the world, bears witness of a Divine power breaking through the order of nature and the routine of human life.[5] Nicene theology, no less than the sacrificial aspect

[1] Matt. iii. 17; iv. 1; xii. 28; Mark i. 10, 12; Luke iii. 22; iv. 1; John i. 32.

[2] Matt. xii. 32.

[3] John xiv. 16. It is interesting to note that the evangelist who recorded the words did not forget, in this secondary application of the Name, that it had belonged primarily to his Master. "We have," he wrote long afterwards, "a Comforter (a *Paraclete*) with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous" (1 John ii. 1).

[4] John xiv. 26; xv. 26.

[5] John xiv. 26; xvi. 8, 13.

of the death of Christ, is traceable to His word, as to its fountain-head.

VI. Not less clearly may we trace in His recorded teaching the germ of all that was most characteristic in that of St. Stephen and St. Paul. The mystery which had been hid from ages and generations, that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs with the seed of Abraham; the truth of the brotherhood of mankind as the necessary correlative of the fatherhood of God; the nullity of the law, and yet more of the rabbinic corruptions of the law, as a ground of righteousness; the truth that man is justified by faith, by trust in a living Person, in the Son of God as manifesting the Father; the truth of a Divine love wide-spreading as the sunlight, and of a universal redemption; and yet of an election of some above their fellows to special knowledge and special blessedness—all that men are sometimes led to classify and label as Pauline theology, we find, at least in hint and outline, in the teaching recorded in the Gospels. That it was not taught explicitly and openly is, of course, obvious enough, for when first preached it came even to the Twelve as something new, and the history of the Apostolic Church shows how slow even Peter and James were to enter into the fulness of its truth. It took its place among the many things which the disciples could not bear

while He was yet with them.[1] If revealed at all, it must have been in secret conversations, like that with Nicodemus ;[2] or questionings, like that with the scribe who was not far from the kingdom of God,[3] where there was greater power of thought than in the fishermen whom He was slowly training to be scribes for the kingdom of heaven, and greater reverence and sympathy than in the stricter Pharisees of the school of Shammai. But for the time, working within the self-imposed limits of His mission, sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, obedient to the law, fulfilling all its righteousness, bringing out its width and depth, entering His protest against the traditions, casuistry, corruptions that had gathered round it, He appeared to His disciples rather as the restorer and vindicator of the law of Moses than as reforming it, annulling it, introducing another law in its place. And yet, if we carry our thoughts from the fullest, widest teaching of St. Paul to that of the Lord Jesus, we shall see that here, also, the disciple was not above his Master, nor the servant above his Lord. The one was sowing, and the other was to reap the harvest; and though we fail to trace any direct influence of the teaching of the One upon the other till the apostle owned that Christ was

[1] 1 John xvi. 12, 5. [2] John iii. 1—21. [3] Mark xii. 34.

"revealed in him;"[1] yet it is no rash conjecture to believe that the truths thus whispered here and there in the ear of this or that disciple, prepared men to welcome them when they were proclaimed as from the housetop by St. Paul. Precisely because these words and acts were remembered and recorded, floating in men's minds and passing from mouth to mouth, were they able, when the time came, to recognize in the apostle of the Gentiles, even more than in any of the Twelve, the mind, the heart, the freedom, the sympathy of Christ.

Look, for example, at the foreshadowings of that calling of the Gentiles which we associate with the apostle's name. True it is that the Lord confined His own work and that of His disciples to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel."[2] They were not, in their first mission, to go into the way of the Gentiles, nor into any city of the Samaritans.[3] And yet, at the very outset of His ministry, He went Himself among that despised and hated people.[4] To them He revealed Himself as the Christ, a Messiah recognizing them, and acknowledged by them, when as yet that confession had passed from the lips of but few Israelites. He contrasts the faith and gratitude

[1] Gal. i. 16.
[2] Matt. xv. 24.
[3] Matt. x. 5.
[4] John iv. 4, 26, 40.

of the leper of that stranger nation with the thanklessness of those of Israel.[1] He presents for men's wonder and love, as a pattern of the law of kindness, the Samaritan, heretic and schismatic though he might be; and the priests and Levites of the temple worship, as patterns only of an unloving, and therefore godless orthodoxy.[2] It becomes known that His heart is with the down-trodden and despised aliens, and when the Scribes seek to bring their sharpest and most envenomed dart, they give vent to the taunting question, "Say we not well that thou art a Samaritan?"[3] I do not dwell on the sympathy and pity shown to publicans and harlots, though they, scorned as they were by their brethren with a more intense scorn than the heathen themselves, might well serve as a crucial instance against the exclusion of any, however vile, from a fellowship into which they had been admitted. But take the more striking witness of the recorded instances of direct contact with those who were not of the seed of Abraham. In the centurion convert—convert, though not in the strict sense a proselyte,—He finds a faith such as He had not found in Israel.[4] He points to it as a representative case of the many who shall come from the East and

[1] Luke xvii. 18.
[2] Luke x. 30—37.
[3] John viii. 48.
[4] Matt. viii. 10; Luke vii. 9.

West, and sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of God. Once, when driven by the malignity of His own countrymen, He goes into the confines of the great Phœnician cities; and if we accept the narrative in its natural meaning,[1] the eager faith of the woman of Canaan has power to stir the depths of His sympathy, and even to change the purpose of His human will.[2] In parables, once and again, He warns His hearers that the wedding feast will be furnished with guests brought in from the highways and hedges of the great heathen world;[3] that the kingdom of God shall be taken from them, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof;[4] that that nation, *sc.*, the Gentile Church, shall be as the stone which the builders rejected, but which becomes the head stone of the corner.[5] When Greeks, heathens

[1] If we accept the better supported reading of Mark vii. 31, He went first within the districts or "coasts" of Tyre, and on His return passed through Sidon itself.

[2] Such is the natural impression which the narrative would leave did it tell us of the words and acts of any other human teacher. The theory of a simulated harshness in the assertion that His work was limited to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, at the very moment when He was purposing to break through the barrier, is surely less consistent with a true estimate of His character. Here, again, men have forgotten the true humanity, and lost sight of the truth that a change of purpose according to change of circumstance is, so far from being an imperfection, the condition of all excellence.

[3] Matt. xxii. 9, 10. [4] Matt. xxi. 43.

[5] In the more usual application of the words, Christ is Himself the "Stone that was set at nought by the builders" (Acts iv. 11), the "chief corner-stone, elect, precious" (1 Pet. ii. 4; Ephes. ii. 20). But in the words as

i.e., by birth, and not as yet full proselytes to Judaism, come seeking to see Him, He welcomes their approach as the first dawn of that glory which was to come, in its fulness, as the sequel and consequence of His death.[1] Here, also, the malignity of His enemies, more acute than the reverence of His followers, led them to discern what they must have looked on as a dangerous tendency to break down the middle wall of partition, and they ask, in tones like that of their former question, "Will He go to the dispersed among the Gentiles?" (the twelve Tribes scattered abroad); but then also—and here lay the sting of their sarcasm—"Will He teach the Gentiles?"[2]

Or turn to that other aspect of the truth which characterizes St. Paul's teaching, and compare that also with the hints and suggestions in the Gospels. The Sermon on the Mount proclaims, it is true, that not one jot or one tittle of the law should fail; that the Son of Man came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil.[3] But there is, even there, a new reading of the

quoted by our Lord in connection with the parable of the vineyard, the "stone which the builders rejected" clearly stands parallel with the "nation bringing forth the fruits of the kingdom." It is with that nation, no longer with the seed of Abraham, that the Christ identifies Himself. The words of Daniel, speaking of the stone that "smote the image" of worldly power "upon the feet that were of iron and clay and brake them in pieces" (Dan. ii. 35), mingle, as our Lord applies the two prophecies, with those of Psa. cxviii.

[1] John xii. 20—24. [2] John vii. 35. [3] Matt. v. 17—19.

law, other than that which prevailed in any of the schools of Palestine or Alexandria; a tone of authority in dealing with it which implied that the law given by Moses, as such, had done its work, and might be compared and contrasted with the eternal law of God, which it did but partially expound; what in a human teacher we should almost describe as an impatience of its merely positive ordinances. If the contrast between His own teaching and that which was said *to* or *by* them of old time be, chiefly or exclusively, a contrast between two modes of interpretation,[1] we yet see that the contrast goes further. One prominent feature in the social legislation of the Mosaic law was declared to have been retrograde, and men were to see in it not the true pattern and law of life, but only the first step forward in a Divine education, rendered necessary because of the hardness of men's hearts.[2] The broad facts of human relationship which had been from the beginning, and were the same for every nation and at all times, were made the basis of

[1] Matt. v. 21—48. Of the four possible modes of interpretation, I adopt that which sees in the ἀρχαίοι, the fathers of later Jewish theology, those whom the *Pirke Aboth* (*sayings of the fathers*) refers to as having received the traditions of the men of the Great Synagogue, and takes the dative as pointing to those *to* whom were given the precepts which our Lord contrasts with His own teaching. So taken, this portion of the Sermon on the Mount may be looked on as a protest against the popular ethics of the Scribes and Pharisees, professing to be based upon the law, but representing it most imperfectly.

[2] Matt. xix. 7, 8; Mark x. 4, 5.

the duties of human life, and placed on a higher level even than special laws given with a Divine authority. Could it be that that thought would remain unfruitful, and be confined only to the solitary instance which called it forth? Did it not suggest a method of interpretation which placed the Mosaic law, as such, and all its ordinances, among the things "decaying and waxing old, and ready to vanish away"?[1] Not less was it so with other and yet more distinctive precepts. The words which proclaimed that not that which goeth into the man, but that which cometh out of the man, brings with it defilement, virtually swept away the whole code as to clean and unclean meats, the whole system of washings and purifications enjoined by the law of Moses.[2] It prepared the way for the acceptance of the truth revealed in St. Peter's vision, both in its literal and symbolic aspects.[3] His proclamation that the Son of Man, as such, as the brother and representative of mankind,[4] was Lord of the Sabbath; that it was lawful to do good on the sabbath day;[5] His words, which showed that there might be a human work, as there confessedly was a

[1] Heb. viii. 13. [2] Matt. xv. 16—20; Mark vii. 18—23. [3] Acts x. 15—28.

[4] This is surely the meaning of the stress laid on the name in Matt. xii. 8, just as that name is also the ground of the authority given to Him by the Father to "execute judgment" (John v. 27). In both cases He acts with the perfect knowledge and sympathy which the name implies.

[5] Mark ii. 28.

Divine work, compatible with rest;[1]—these (even if we do not admit the more striking and wider teaching which a credible tradition gives us[2]) placed the observance of that day on a new footing, swept aside all the harshness and hypocrisy which had gathered round it, cancelled the positive elements of the law itself, and left it open to His apostles to class sabbaths and new moons as among the shadows that pass away,[3] and to His Church to transfer, as He, indirectly at least, taught it to transfer, the day, and modify, in varying degrees, according to change of times and necessities of life, the degree of its observance.[4] Circumcision itself, the very badge and seal of the covenant, he places in its true position, not as part of the law of Moses, but as belonging to "the fathers of Israel," to Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob;[5] and so prepares the way for the contrast which St. Paul afterwards drew out between the covenant made with Abraham and that of which Moses was the mediator,[6]—for the further question, in what relation the ordinance itself stood to the pattern life

[1] John v. 17. [2] Compare note, p. 32. [3] Col. ii. 16.

[4] Historically, as I have attempted to show elsewhere (*Sunday*, p. 16), the transfer was not by any solemn act, but the result of a gradual process; but it is also clear that, when once made, the recollections that clustered round it as having been the day of the Lord's resurrection, and of at least one subsequent manifestation of His presence (John xx. 26), would give a sanction and a permanence to the change. [5] John vii. 22. [6] Gal. iii. 17—24.

of righteousness with which it was historically connected.[1] And on this point His silence was even more emphatic than His teaching. Nowhere does He name what had been the indispensable condition of entering into the theocracy of Israel, as a condition of His kingdom. His own baptism was, indeed, administered to circumcised men, but the command to His apostles was definite and clear, and had a significance which even they did but imperfectly apprehend,—"Go ye and teach all the heathen, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost," without one syllable as to the necessity or worth of circumcision.[2] What was true of the sign and the day that were badges of the faith of Israel, was true also of its locality. Here, also, there was (I speak once more after the manner of men) a union, almost unparalleled, of devoutest reverence for the past, and boldness in looking forward to the future. Zeal for His Father's house was as a consuming fire within Him, and both at the beginning and close of His ministry it showed itself in strange acts in vindication of its honour;[3] and yet He told her who worshipped on Gerizim that the distinction between her sanctuary and that of Israel was even

[1] Rom. iv. 8—13. [2] Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 16.
[3] John ii. 17; Matt. xxi. 12; Mark xi. 15; Luke xix. 45.

then as nothing; that neither in that mountain nor yet at Jerusalem should men worship the Father, as in an exclusive sanctuary.[1] He foretold, in words which, if they were kept secret for a time by the four to whom they were spoken, must have found their way, here and there, to hearts prepared for them, and were reproduced in the teaching of St. Stephen,[2] that not "one stone of the temple should be left upon another,"[3] and with the destruction of the temple the whole office of the priesthood and the whole ritual of sacrifice passed away irretrievably for ever.[4] Once again there was an almost preternatural acuteness in the hostility of His accusers, when they charged Him with having threatened that destruction, and the disciple who, in this also, was "likest Him in look and

[1] John iv. 21.

[2] The recorded teaching of Stephen is broken off abruptly, precisely at the point at which he was about to touch on this charge of the indictment; but, few as the words are (Acts vii. 48—50), they are in the tone, not of one who denies what he had been charged with, *sc.*, predicting the destruction of the temple (vi. 14), but of one who is prepared to justify that prediction, and show its relation to God's government of His people.

[3] Matt. xxiv. 2; Mark xiii. 2; Luke xxi. 6. Here, as in so many other instances, there is a singular parallelism between our Lord's work and that of the prophet of Anathoth. He, too, taught the men of his time that their boasted trust in the temple of the Lord was false; that they had made it a den of robbers; that it would be destroyed, even as Shiloh had been (Jer. vii. 1—16).

[4] It is clear that the teaching of Heb. viii. 13; x. 22, is but the natural development of that of St. Stephen, the truth to which the Spirit led men on when they started from the fact that the days of the temple worship were numbered, and that it had done its work.

tone," with having taught that Jesus of Nazareth should destroy that holy place, and change the customs which Moses had delivered.

So it was, then, as regards the great lines of thought which, represented in the apostolic age by different teachers, and having each of them its special witnesses and preachers in the ages that have followed, have yet blended together to form the theology of Christendom, and are traceable, as we have seen, to the theology of Christ. And what is true of them is true also of many less conspicuous elements in the life of each. Even the outward circumstances of His life—the voluntary poverty, the protest in word and act against the pursuit of riches, and the selfishness and luxury to which they lead, the loyal companionship of those who trust each other and have all one purse, —these, though they were no part of His legislation for mankind, no conditions of admission to His kingdom, have yet had a marvellous tendency to reproduce themselves in proportion to the earnestness and zeal of men's belief. We see it in the free, ungrudging community of goods in the first days of the Apostolic Church; in all monastic orders; in all endeavours, within the pale of the Church or outside it, to reproduce something of the old brotherhood and equality; in the recognition of the slave (even while his outward

position continued as before) as a "brother beloved,"[1] with equal rights to respect, sympathy, forbearance. In varying forms we shall see, in exact proportion as the human life of Christ is realized and understood among us, (though our familiarity with it almost blinds us to its significance,) that all works of love and goodness which have marked the course of Christianity have been no merely natural outgrowths of human culture or civilization, but ever-widening circles, expanding on and on for ever over the world's wide sea, but taking their first impulse from the sympathy and philanthropy of Christ. In His pity for sufferers from disease we have the starting-point of all hospitals; in His exorcisms that of all true treatment of the insane; in His sympathy and yearning over publicans and harlots, of all reformatories and penitentiaries.

I do not now dwell on these facts, as men have often rightly dwelt on them, as an argument for the truth of Christianity from the good which it has produced. That argument has its weight. It at least bids men pause before they lay their axe, as they think, to the root of the tree which has borne such goodly fruit. It bids them ask themselves whether any other tree in God's great garden of the world—any system,

[1] Philem. 16.

or society, or doctrine—can be compared to it for glory and for beauty; whether it be indeed, as we have deemed, as a tree of life which our Heavenly Father hath planted, or only as a "tree of the knowledge of good and evil," which has enlarged the capacities of men for either, and done nothing more. But the point of view from which I have wished to look on all these facts now, is that from which we see in them so many proofs of the marvellous and, so to speak, *fontal* fulness of the mind of Christ, and its harmony with all that is most characteristic of the mind of Christendom. All the theology of which the Church is the witness and the keeper runs up to His teaching; all the benevolence of which she has been the minister, to His example; all her infinite richness and variety of worship, to the Prayer and the Supper of the Lord. May we not recognize in this that of which the history of mankind may perhaps present distortions, caricatures, counterfeits, but to which it certainly offers no parallel? Can the marvellous personality which has thus stamped its impress on the world's history be resolved into the creature of the afterthoughts of an age that followed it, or of the confluence of the theosophies of the East and West in the age that went before it? Can we exclude the personality of Christ from the order of the ages, and

classify His faith as but one in the steps which lead men upwards from brute ignorance to the negation of God? Can we accept, admire, and adore the personality, and yet reject the claims with which it is inseparably associated, and without which it would have been powerless as the visions of a dreamer, a nullity among the elements of history?

VII.

THE MINISTERIAL WORK OF CHRIST.

VII.

THE MINISTERIAL WORK OF CHRIST.

IT is no part of my present purpose to harmonize the narratives of the four Gospels into a continuous biography. What I now wish to trace is the progress of the antagonism between the teaching of our Lord, such in its broad outlines as we have seen it, and that which prevailed among the schools of Jerusalem; to mark its several stages of growing bitterness till it ended in His death. It is inevitable, in any such representation, that the human side of our Lord's works should, for the time, be most prominent. We have to ask what He seemed to others? what were the outward phases of His life? who were His chief friends and foes? what were the surroundings of His work as a rabbi or a prophet? As we trace the protests, struggles, sufferings of

Isaiah and Jeremiah, so we have to trace His. But in proportion as we do this thoroughly, we shall find, I believe, that with the likeness there is also an immeasurable difference. His claims are not as the claims of any prophet who had preceded Him, but stand on a higher level, and demand a more entire submission. More than any prophet does He in character, word, act, rise above the influence of all surrounding circumstances into a wonderful and unapproachable originality. I do not say that either claim or character alone would prove a more than human nature. The union of the two may be left to do its work, as part of the evidence of the faith of Christians, that the human was united with the Divine.

It is clear that up to the time of the return from the temptation in the wilderness, no claim whatever had been advanced. Then, partly through the testimony of the Baptist, partly through the impression of His own words, He gathers round Him the five or six disciples who, through all the Gospel history, are the foremost of the band, and who even then, without sign or wonder, own Him as the Christ.[1] With them He goes to Galilee, and there, at the marriage feast of Cana (the new claim arousing new expectations in her who was able to connect it with the past), He

[1] John i. 35—52.

manifested His glory, and His disciples believed on Him.[1] It may well be, though numbers are not given us, that they increased, and that when He arrived in Jerusalem it was not indeed in the character of the Christ (for that was as yet whispered only as in the secret chamber), but in that of a rabbi claiming to be a prophet. It was the Paschal feast, and the city must have been crowded with pilgrims of all nations; and He, with words and symbolic acts which remind us, and must have reminded them, of the prophet of Anathoth,[2] appeared as protesting against a desecration of the temple which priests and Levites had long sanctioned or connived at. The act appealed to the reverence which every Israelite had for the temple; and we may infer, from the absence of resistance, that it met with a response,[3] —that the priests, and the scribes who acted with

[1] The silence of St. John as to the history of the infancy makes the hint here given all the more significant. The mother turns to her Son, accompanied, as He now is for the first time, by a body of disciples, as expecting Him to put forth power, or give counsel, to meet the failure of the supply of wine. His words, "My hour is not yet come," are spoken in answer to her unuttered thoughts, just as afterwards like words were spoken to His brethren when they bade Him manifest Himself to the world, and do at Jerusalem what He had been doing in Galilee (John vii. 3—6).

[2] Jer. vii. 1—11.

[3] In all probability the desecration of the temple was the act of the Sadducean aristocracy of the priesthood. The feeling of the leaders of both sections of the Pharisees must have been strongly against it, and they had a far larger following among the people.

them, shrank from the prospect of a collision in which the multitude would have been against them. But that which gave the act a more awful significance was that then, for the first time since He entered on His work, He uttered in the ears of men the words, "My Father."[1] He asserted a relationship to which others had no claim except through Him. They, in their turn, asked of Him a sign ; and He gave it them, as other prophets had given of old, in the form of a prediction.[2] What the words meant they knew not then, but their startling form made the impression which they left indelible, and they were ultimately the ground-work of the charges brought against Him, and so worked out, in a strange and unexpected way their own fulfilment.[3]

It may be that there were then, as afterwards, works of healing at Jerusalem, which helped to draw

[1] Here, again, St. Luke helps us to understand St. John. The zeal of the Christ for His Father's house was the natural development of that reverence for, and delight in it as such, which had been shown in His boyhood (Luke ii. 49). What had then been spoken, as in the dawn of His human consciousness, had ripened, through the witness of His baptism, into the fullest knowledge.

[2] Compare the instances of Micaiah (1 Kings xxii. 24) and Jeremiah (xx. 1—6 ; xxviii. 15—17).

[3] Matt. xxvi. 61 ; Mark xiv. 58. The evangelists who record the charge make no mention of the words on which it rested. St. John gives the words, but not the accusation that grew out of them. We find from the latter that it was not a simple invention, but the distortion of words which had been spoken at the commencement of His ministry, and which the renewal of His protest against the desecration of the temple had naturally recalled to their memory.

men's minds to Him and fix their faith, and to which Nicodemus refers, as proofs that led him to recognize in the new rabbi, a "teacher sent from God."[1] In that recognition he was the representative of a class. Many there were of the better Pharisees of the school of Hillel, who drew back at once from the harshness, worldliness, negations of the Sadducean priesthood, and from the hypocrisy and formalism of the school of Shammai, and who watched the appearance of the new Teacher with interest and approval. In their name, Nicodemus, standing almost on the same level then as Gamaliel did afterwards, came to tender their adhesion.[2] They would support Him in His work, and some day or other recognize Him openly. The answer which he met with was addressed, as all our Lord's answers were, to the thoughts which He read, rather than to the words with which men strive to conceal them. It may be that the rabbi shrank from the act which involved an open confession of his faith at once; it may be

[1] John iii. 2.

[2] He speaks, it will be remembered, in the plural—"*We* know;" and our Lord's words in reply soon pass into it. "Marvel not that I said unto *thee;*" but immediately afterwards, "*Ye* receive not our testimony," "*ye* believe not" (iii. 11, 12). The section in *Ecce Homo* (pp. 85, 86), on the character of Nicodemus and those who thought with him, may be referred to as supporting the view here taken, and as one of the most interesting and thoughtful sections of that book.

that he looked on the baptism which the new Teacher followed John in administering, with its accompaniments of confession and conversion, as fitted for men of a lower class but not fitted for Himself.[1] In either case the words he heard told him that the support which he and his fellows tendered was not needed, and would not be accepted; that he must take the same position as the lowest and the vilest; that for him not less than for the proselyte from heathenism a new birth was needed.[2] The rebuke fell on a heart that was not hardened. There was, as the sequel showed, a capacity for truth in that Master of Israel, and to him accordingly (in the hearing, probably, of the beloved disciple)[3] was given an insight into the mysteries of the kingdom. Not the secret of the new birth only, but those also of the Incarnation and the Atonement, were revealed to him, when as yet the Galilæan disciples were, for the most

[1] The words of John iv. 1, show that baptism was from the very first the condition of entrance into the brotherhood of disciples. Nicodemus and those who thought with him could not have been recognized as disciples without it; yet to this they could not bring themselves.

[2] The question, "Art thou the teacher, the honoured rabbi of Israel, and knowest not these things?" implies that both in the language of the prophets (Ezek. xxxii. 25—27) and in that of the rabbinic schools as to the baptism of proselytes, there was enough to suggest another answer to the words which spoke of being "born again," than the half-dull, half-flippant remarks with which Nicodemus had replied to them.

[3] For the facts which suggest this inference, see p. 72.

part, but in the first stage of their training to be scribes. The Son of Man was also the only begotten Son of God. He must be lifted up, even as the brazen serpent had been. God had sent Him not to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved. He was the Light of the world, and every one would hate or love that light according as his deeds were evil or had been wrought in God.[1] The doctrines were in fact new altogether, —new certainly in their personal embodiment. The thoughts, as our Lord's words imply, were in part familiar, and ought not to have been hard and dark to one whose knowledge went beyond the traditions of the scribes of Jerusalem. The result of the interview was the formation, within the Sanhedrim itself, of a party recognizing the work of Jesus, but afraid to acknowledge Him, oscillating between reverence for truth and care for their own repute;—the representatives of the waverers and half-hearted of all times and churches; rendering some service, it may be, to the cause of truth, by urging fairness, caution, moderation, yet shutting themselves out, wholly or in part, for a time or for ever, from the blessings of its freedom and its life.[2]

[1] John iii. 13—21.

[2] The next appearance of Nicodemus (John vii. 50—52) shows the partial

The work of the Teacher went on, however, without reference to them. Great as the crowds had been that streamed to the baptism of John, those that came to the baptism of Jesus were yet greater.[1] The disciples of the former were jealous over their Master's waning fame, and already there seemed a contrast between the thoughts of the two teachers.[2] The Baptist's answer was like that which Moses had given to Joshua, "Enviest thou for my sake?"[3] He could see, in this power to draw all men to Him, the proof that the Bridegroom had come and claimed His bride.[4]

acknowledgment to which he had been led; and in xii. 42, the evangelist distinctly describes the class as numerous. Less direct, but equally suggestive statements are found in the taunt of our Lord's brethren bidding Him go up to Jerusalem, that His disciples there might see the signs which He wrought (vii. 3), as though they were waiting to acknowledge Him; and the question of the more hostile section, obviously intended to cow the neutral or half-convinced party into silence—"Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on Him?" (vii. 48).

[1] John iv. 1, 2.

[2] John iii. 25, 26. The controversy of John's disciples had been with some unnamed representative of the ruling body of the teachers of Jerusalem, and it had turned upon "purification." Interpreting the hint thus given by our Lord's teaching elsewhere, what seems probable is, that the disciples of the Baptist came in contact with one of the Nicodemus section, and heard from him what reflected our Lord's teaching, on the one hand, as to the nullity of any outward purification, such as we find it in Matt. xv. 20, and on the other as to the higher meaning and power of the true baptism with water and the Spirit. Perplexed at hearing what seemed to them a disparagement of their master's work, they came to him to tell him that he is being supplanted.

[3] Numb. xi. 29. [4] John iii. 29.

The journey through Samaria I have already spoken of as one of the foreshadowings of the universality of His kingdom. Its close connexion with what followed almost immediately on it is forced upon our notice as soon as we attempt to harmonize the narrative of St. John's Gospel with those of the other three. He had been in Jerusalem, Judæa, Samaria, Capernaum, and had made disciples in each of them. With a true human clinging to the kindred, friends, neighbours, with whom His youth and earlier manhood had been spent, He will go to Nazareth and proclaim the truth to them. He finds amazement, but no belief. His brethren could not understand the transformation of the patient, laborious worker into the Rabbi and the Prophet; still less could they accept Him as the Christ. The neighbours gathered in the synagogue are equally incredulous. He has met with more faith among the despised Samaritan than he finds "in His own country and in His father's house." He tells the unbelieving crowds that they are reproducing the older history of their race. As it had been, when not the lepers of Israel were cleansed, but Naaman the Syrian, and not the widow of Israel was fed, but the widow of Sarepta,[1]

[1] Luke iv. 26—30.

so was it still. Nazareth was left to itself. Capernaum, which had been a place of temporary sojourn before, became the centre of His work.[1] Disciples gathered round Him. Those who had come to Him at first He now called to a special nearness, and the Twelve, if not already designated, were prominent among their fellows.

Another visit to Jerusalem, in all probability at the feast of Purim,[2] made an immense change in

[1] The previous work at Capernaum, implied in Luke iv. 23, is brought before us more definitely in John iv. 54. There had been wrought the second "sign," the healing of the courtier's servant, the fame of which drew disciples round Him. It deserves notice that the fact thus recorded by St. John, concerning one who was, as his title shows (βασιλικὸς) attached to the court of the Tetrarch Antipas, is in part explained by the fact that at this period the Baptist had come into close contact with that household (Matt. iv. 12, Mark i. 14), and, in its turn, explains the existence in it of the believers whom St. Luke mentions,—Joanna the wife of Chuza, and Manaen, the foster-brother of the Tetrarch (Luke viii. 3, Acts xiii. 1).

[2] I follow Tischendorf and Wieseler in their view of the *vexata quæstio* of the feast of John v. 1. (1.) Assuming, as is probable, that the "four months" of John iv. 35 refer to the period of the year when they were spoken, we then have to fix the feast between that date, December or January, and the Passover of John vi. 4; and the Jewish calendar presents no feast in the interval but that of Purim. (2.) St. John names the Passover (ii. 13; vi. 4; xii. 1), the Feast of Tabernacles (vii. 2), and the Feast of Dedication (x. 22), and we have therefore to account, if possible, for the exceptional omission of the name here. The special character of the Purim feast; the difficulties which the name would present to Gentile readers, without a long explanation; the fact that the national exclusiveness of the Jews culminated in it, may well explain the apostle's departure, in this instance, from his usual custom. The addition of the article, high as is the MS. authority on which it rests, was probably the aftergrowth of the conjecture of Irenæus (now all but unanimously rejected), that the feast in question was the Passover. (3.) General as are the words of v. 41—44, they may yet be thought of as having a special

the relations between Him and the Sanhedrim. Now, for the first time, His teaching and practice on the Sabbath came into direct collision with theirs; and with the fanaticism which a false zeal for the Sabbath always engenders, they sought to slay Him. When He vindicated both by comparing His Sabbath-work to that of His Father—"My Father worketh hitherto, and I also work,"[1] they shuddered at what seemed to them a blasphemous presumption. They "sought the more to kill Him," and yet they were obviously withheld by policy or fear.[2] The disciples were too strong; the Galilæan multitudes present at the feast were likely to support their favourite teacher. They must first undermine His influence there.

Here again we find in St. John the secret history, as it were, of the facts which meet us as unconnected in the other three Gospels. It is shortly after this that we note the unwonted presence in the synagogue of Capernaum of scribes and doctors of the law from Jerusalem.[3] They dog His footsteps as the Judaizers

fitness at a feast, which, not being of Divine institution, was simply the expression of national boastfulness and mutual praises, and at which well-nigh every Jew identified himself in thought with the man whom "the king delighted to honour" (Est. vi. 11).

[1] John v. 17. [2] John v. 16—18.

[3] Luke v. 17. Bishop Ellicott is, so far as I know, the first writer who has given these facts the prominence which they deserve. (*Hulsean Lectures*, p. 169.)

afterwards dogged those of St. Paul ; and the charges which they begin to scatter, for which they eagerly find or make occasions, are precisely those which the ruling body at Jerusalem had stamped with their approval. They charge Him there also with slighting the traditional purifications of religious Jews,[1] with setting lightly by the Sabbath,[2] with neglecting fasts,[3] with claiming that power to forgive sins which they classified as a Divine attribute, and so with blasphemy.[4] In the very work in which His power to heal and save rose to its highest point, they, the scribes from Jerusalem, saw only a token of evil and not of good ; and when they saw the frenzied demoniacs calmed and soothed, had their solution ready —" He casteth out devils by Beelzebub."[5] They are at first baffled. The new and more formidable antagonism seems indeed to have alarmed His mother and His brethren, and they seek to restrain His work,[6] but great multitudes still gather round Him. He teaches them no longer in the synagogues only or

[1] Matt. xv. 1 ; Mark vii. 1.

[2] Matt. xii. 2 ; Mark ii. 24 ; Luke vi. 2.

[3] Matt. ix. 14 ; Mark ii. 18 ; Luke v. 33. In this instance we may probably trace an attempt, on the part of the Pharisees, to utilize for their own purposes the jealousy with which the disciples of the Baptist looked on the new Teacher (John iii. 26).

[4] Matt. ix. 3 ; Mark ii. 7 ; Luke v. 21.

[5] Matt. xii. 24 ; Mark iii. 22.

[6] Matt. xii. 46 ; Mark iii. 31 ; Luke viii. 19.

chiefly, but on mountain heights, and open plains, and on the shore of the inland sea.[1] He begins to organize the floating mass of converts, and the Twelve are chosen to be His special representatives.[2] Among the converts are some at least of the upper and wealthier class of Galilee and Peræa, and they supply the mission fund for Him and His disciples.[3] Even the Pharisees of Galilee think it worth their while to recognize and invite Him.[4] First the imprisonment and then the death of the Baptist threw into the ranks of the disciples those who were now left as sheep that have lost their shepherd.[5] The Passover was coming near, and the highways of Galilee swarmed with eager pilgrims.[6] Had He aimed at the kingdoms of the world and their glory, there was enough to tempt, I do not say the far-seeing sagacity of one of the great actors of the world's dramas, but the hopes and the ambition of one who had grown up in a Galilæan village. After the feeding of the five thousand, the one eager impulse

[1] On the "mountain" of Matt. v. 1; the "plain," or mountain plateau, of Luke vi. 17; the "desert place" near Bethsaida of Luke ix. 10; the "shore" and "ship" of Matt. xiii. 2.

[2] Matt. x. 2; Mark iii. 14; Luke vi. 13.

[3] Luke viii. 1—3.

[4] Luke vii. 36; xi. 37.

[5] The accession of disciples from this quarter is indicated in Matt. xiv. 12; Mark vi. 34. It coincided with the results of the first systematic mission of the Twelve (Matt. ix. 36).

[6] John vi. 4.

of the multitude is to make Him, against His will, a king.[1] It is precisely from this moment that we trace the decline of His popularity and influence as a teacher; and that decline is the consequence, not only or chiefly of the slanders of His enemies, but of His own deliberate act, with all its consequences clearly foreseen by Him. It was not enough to withdraw Himself from the applause and clamour of the people, and, as if once again wrestling with the tempter, to pass the night on the lonely hill, and in intensity of prayer: He must not only refuse but repel all false homage, springing from false notions of His work.[2] The low craving for the loaves and fishes, the hardly more noble appetite for signs and wonders, the expectation of an earthly kingdom,—these He must sweep away at once. He unfolds, in more startling words than men had ever before heard, the true nature of His work. He calls men to eat His flesh and drink His blood.[3] And the words look backward as well as forward. If, on the one hand, we cannot fail to connect them (whatever

[1] John vi. 15.

[2] The reason of the withdrawal is given by St. John (vi. 15). St. Matthew and St. Mark use the singularly strong expression that He "constrained" (ἠνάγκασεν) His disciples to embark and cross the lake, as if seeking to save them from the contagious enthusiasm of the multitude. After this came the night spent in solitude and prayer (Matt. xiv. 23; Mark vi. 46).

[3] John vi. 33, 53.

method of interpretation we apply in detail) with the symbolism of the Last Supper and the ordinance by which we believe the symbolism and the reality to be perpetuated, they recall, on the other, not less clearly that conflict in the wilderness, in which the thought that "man doth not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God,"[1] had been His stay against the suggestions of the tempter. The "hard saying" answered its purpose. It acted as a test, sifting the wheat from the chaff, the true-hearted from the careless; and the sensuous many, who till then had professed themselves His disciples, or actually followed in His train, now walked no more with Him. The Twelve met the question, "Will ye also go away?" with the answer, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life."[2]

The scene of this discourse, St. John tells us, was the synagogue of Capernaum;[3] but he adds a fact, which, incidental as the mention of it is, is yet of

[1] Matt. iv. 4; Luke iv. 4. The first echo of the words which thus meet us at the threshold of our Lord's work is found after the conversation with the woman of Samaria. "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me" (John iv. 33). What we find in vi. 35 is an expansion of the same thought, revealing the identity of His own Being with the "true bread from heaven," the "word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." The "hidden manna" of Rev. ii. 17 carries the thought one step further.

[2] John vi. 60—69.

[3] John vi. 59.

singular significance. Those who listened were not merely the ordinary Galilæan congregation. The teachers of Judæa, the scribes from Jerusalem,[1] were still there, leading the opposition against Him; and accordingly the teaching has all the characteristics which we recognize as specially belonging to that recorded by St. John, and differs from that which we find as the common element of the other three Gospels. Their presence at Capernaum, too, serves to explain the one solitary journey beyond the land of Israel into the way of the Gentiles; the withdrawal not only from Judæa, where "the Jews sought to kill Him,"[2] but even from Galilee, where their malignity had followed Him, to the coasts of Tyre and Sidon.[3] He seemed almost to seek to hide Himself for a while, till that tyranny had overpast. When He returned it was to experience once more the bitter hostility of

[1] Up to ver. 41, St. John speaks only of the multitudes from Galilæan towns and villages. Then the new disputants appear, whom the evangelist names by the term which he always employs to designate the scribes and rulers of Jerusalem (John v. 16; vii. 1, 13, 15; ix. 18), and who had come, as the other Gospels show, to organize the opposition to His work at Capernaum.

[2] John vii. 1.

[3] In Tischendorf's arrangement of the events of this period (*Synops. Evang.*, §§ 63, 64), the charge against the disciples for eating with unwashed hands, and the journey beyond the frontiers of Israel, follow immediately on the discourse of John vi. 22—65. No harmonist of the Gospels differs materially from this order, and Wieseler, the most elaborate and exhaustive of all, places it on the selfsame day. (*Synopsis of the Four Gospels*, p. 281, in M. Venables' *Translation.*)

the parties that had coalesced against Him—Pharisees, Sadducees, Herodians,[1]—the contrast between the vague, unsteadfast homage of the multitude and the growing faith of the apostles, who confessed that He was indeed the Christ, the Son of the living God.[2] But the sense of approaching loneliness, suffering, death, becomes stronger, and He speaks of them more openly. This, for the Twelve even, is a harder saying than any words, however startling, as to eating His flesh had been. It cuts at the root of their dreams of the kingdom of the Christ, which He, as yet, had not rudely dashed to the ground, but left to the teaching of experience.[3] It calls from Peter the protest which, for a time, identified his voice with the whisper of the tempter.[4]

As we have seen the course of His ministry in Jerusalem influencing that in Galilee, so in the

[1] Matt. xvi. 1. Here, again, the influence of the emissaries from Jerusalem is distinctly traceable. They ask for a sign from heaven, as in John ii. 18; vi. 30. The varying versions of His answer—"Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees," in Matt. xvi. 6; "of the leaven of the Pharisees, and of the leaven of Herod," in Mark viii. 15—indicates not only the Sadducæan character of the Herodian school, but the renewal of the combination which had been formed before between the scribes of Jerusalem and those of Galilee.

[2] Matt. xvi. 13—16; Mark viii. 27—29; Luke ix. 18—27. The words of John vi. 66—71 seem to connect this confession with the desertion of the half-hearted disciples.

[3] Matt. xvi. 21; Mark viii. 31; Luke ix. 21, 22.

[4] "Get thee behind Me, Satan" (Matt. xvi. 23; Mark viii. 33). Here, again, we have an echo of words spoken in the conflict in the wilderness (Matt. iv. 10).

seventh chapter of St. John we find, I believe, traces of a reciprocal action from Galilee upon Jerusalem. The opposition has gathered strength. The company of the disciples is diminished. His brethren, still unbelieving, use taunting words, which imply that if He has disciples at all, they are to be found among the schools of Jerusalem, not in the towns of Galilee.[1] The people were more divided than they had been. Even those who in their secret hearts acknowledged Him to be better than themselves were living under a dominion which hindered them from speaking openly.[2] So threatening was the storm, that the evangelist recognizes the postponement of its violence as the result of a distinct act of the Divine Will.[3] Then for the first time the scribes and the chief priests, the ultra Pharisees and the ultra Sadducees, ventured on the attempt to seize Him. The strange power of His speech and look revived for a time the faith of some.[4] Nicodemus was at least brave enough to protest against violent haste.[5] The Jews at Jerusalem repeat the blasphemy which had been uttered at Capernaum by their emissaries,—"He hath a devil, and is mad."[6] The healing of the blind man, with all its attendant circumstances; the terror of His parents;

[1] John vii. 3. [2] Ver. 13. [3] Ver. 30. [4] Ver. 30—32.
[5] Ver. 50. [6] John viii. 48—52; x. 20.

the threats of the Pharisees; the secret conspiracy, bursting out a few weeks afterwards into open violence,—all these marked an increasing bitterness.[1] Driven from Jerusalem, driven wholly or in part from Galilee also, He finds a refuge in the country beyond Jordan, the province of Peræa, the scene of the Baptist's work, part of the tetrarchy of Antipas.[2]

It is precisely at this point of the history that the narrative of St. Luke becomes most ample in its details. Without attempting an exact harmony, it is, I believe, clear, in the judgment of all commentators, that from Luke ix. 51 onwards, we have chiefly the record of the ministry in Peræa. We cannot take the words, "When the time was come that He should be received up, He steadfastly set His face to go to Jerusalem," and throw them back to any earlier period than that Feast of Tabernacles in John vii.[3] And if so, we are able, I believe, to trace in well-nigh every part of His teaching in that ministry the natural sequel of what had passed in Galilee and Jerusalem. The very words which immediately pre-

[1] John ix. and x. The interval between the Feast of Tabernacles and that of the Dedication was exactly two months.

[2] John x. 40, 41.

[3] An exact harmony is difficult,—it may be, impossible. Tischendorf's arrangement places the whole history of Luke ix. 51—62 as occurring on the journey to the Feast of Tabernacles; Luke x. i.; xiii. 17, between it and that of the Dedication.

cede it, "He that is not against us is for us," speak of the sense of loneliness which welcomes even imperfect sympathy.[1] Men had asked at Jerusalem, "Will He go and teach the Gentiles?" and now He appoints the seventy disciples, who were, by the very fact of their number, a witness to all Jewish minds of the coming expansion of His kingdom.[2] Now is it that He utters His woes against the Galilæan cities—Chorazin, Bethsaida, Capernaum[3]—which had rejected Him, and, in words afterwards repeated more solemnly, against the hypocrisy of the scribes and Pharisees of Jerusalem.[4] Now, and that too, it should be remembered, in spite of the recent refusal of the Samaritans to receive Him, He makes one of that despised race the pattern of a perfect charity like His own, while the priest and Levite represent nothing but their own heartless selfishness.[5] There, where Pilate's quarrel with the Tetrarch was matter of common talk, and men told

[1] Luke ix. 50.

[2] Luke x. 1. The idea that seventy was the number of all the heathen nations of the world is found in Jewish writers (*Succah.*, fol. 55. *Bemidb. Rabb.*, § 22, in Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* on John vii.), and was based upon a strange misinterpretation of Deut. xxxii. 8. The fact that seventy bullocks had been offered at the Feast of Tabernacles but a short time before for the heathen world (Lightfoot, *l. c.*), gave a special significance to this new appointment.

[3] Luke x. 13, 14. The occurrence of like words in Matt. xi. 20—24 may be due rather to a disregard of chronological order, or may indicate that the words were as a kind of prophetic formula of reproach.

[4] Compare Luke xi. 37—52, and Matt. xxiii.

[5] Luke x. 25—37. The refusal of the Samaritans had all but immediately preceded it, Luke ix. 51—56.

Him of the cause of quarrel, He checked their rash haste in interpreting calamities as judgments, as He had checked the haste of His disciples when they asked Him concerning the man that was born blind.[1] There, when certain of the Pharisees (probably some of His timid, half-hearted adherents) bade Him depart because Herod sought to kill Him, He turned, as one who saw the danger that threatened Him more clearly than they did, and bade them know that it could not be that a prophet should perish out of Jerusalem.[2] There He hints once again, partly in direct speech, partly in parables, at the admission of the heathen world. Men shall come from the east and from the west, from the north and from the south.[3] The guests of the great supper are to be brought in from the streets and the lanes, from the highways and the hedges.[4] Through all the parables

[1] Compare Luke xiii. 5, and John ix. 3. The two were separated from each other by an interval of a few weeks only.

[2] Luke xiii. 31. There is clearly an apparent, possibly a real, desire on the part of the Pharisees here spoken of to warn Him against coming danger. The fact harmonizes with St. John's statement that, up to this time, many of the "chief rulers" still believed on Him (xii. 42), and with the fact that, almost immediately afterwards, He went into the house of one of the "chief rulers" of the Pharisee party to eat bread on the Sabbath day (Luke xiv. 1).

[3] Luke xiii. 29.

[4] Luke xiv. 21—23. The interpretation of the parable was even then obvious. The guests from the streets and lanes of the city were "the publicans and harlots," the "violent men," outcasts from society, but still within the visible polity of Israel. But if so, then the "highways and hedges" must have indicated a yet further expansion, taking in even the Samaritans and the heathen.

that follow—the lost sheep, the lost piece of money, the prodigal son—there is, among many other lessons, a protest against the selfish exclusiveness of the religionists of Israel—a proclamation of the love of God not for the lost sheep of that fold alone, but for all who were scattered, wherever they might be, without a shepherd.[1]

What is specially characteristic of the teaching of this period is the continuous protest—as in the parables of the unjust steward and the rich man and Lazarus[2]—against the worldliness and mammon-worship even of the better class of the Pharisees, who were not parties to the antagonism of the priests and rulers of Jerusalem. They come to Him asking—tauntingly if they were His foes, expectantly if they were His friends—when the kingdom of God should come, and are told that it "cometh not with observation," that it is already in the midst of them; that it must be received as by little children; that the penitent, sin-burdened publican is better fitted for it than they

[1] Luke xv. Here, again, we get a fresh light thrown on St. Luke's record by remembering that the parable of the lost sheep followed, with no long interval, on the words, "Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold; and them also I must bring," John x. 16.

[2] Luke xvi. We may note here, too, the close connexion between the parable and the facts that had immediately preceded it. He had seen and rebuked the selfish luxury even of the Pharisees who were willing to invite Him (xiv. 7—14).

in their self-righteous confidence.[1] Even the young rich ruler, so earnest, reverential, adoring, winning the love of Christ as Lazarus won it, is put to the sharp test which, for a time at least, repels him.[2] At or about this time, difficult as it is to arrive at an exact harmony, He is summoned to raise the Lazarus whom He loved in spite of his wealth and his associates, whose name had so strangely and exceptionally appeared in the parable that warned the Pharisees of their besetting sin.[3]

The effect of that mighty wonder is seen in the new burst of enthusiasm among His disciples and the multitude.[4] He sees that that form of glory is but the prelude to the higher glory of the death upon the cross;[5] but they, with an obstinacy which the narrative of St. John explains, and almost excuses, refuse to believe that it can be so. Now, as He crosses the fords of the Jordan, the pilgrims gather on their way to the coming Passover. Many, even of the ruling

[1] Luke xvii. 20; xviii. 9—14.

[2] Matt. xix. 16—22; Mark x. 17—22; Luke xviii. 18—23.

[3] John x. I have ventured elsewhere (Art. "Lazarus" in Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*) to suggest what seems to me the most probable explanation both of this solitary appearance of a name in our Lord's parables, and of the history of the young ruler whom "Jesus loved" (Mark x. 21). Startling as the hypothesis may at first seem, it will, I believe, be found to harmonize and explain phænomena with a clearness which no other explanation attains to.

[4] John xi. 45; Matt. xix. 2; Mark x. 1.

[5] Compare the renewed predictions of His death in Matt. xx. 17—19; Mark x. 32—34; Luke xviii. 31—34; Matt. xx. 23; Mark x. 45.

class, believe on Him. They expect that the kingdom of God shall immediately appear.[1] The multitude follow Him on the ascent from Jericho to Jerusalem. There is a Sabbath halt at Bethany, and again Lazarus and his friends—as though the lessons against wealth had at last done their work—make a great feast, and lavish their riches partly on His followers, partly on Himself.[2]

The hour long waited-for is now come, and He will do nothing to avert it. He will enter Jerusalem, not as at the last feast, silently and unobserved, but in His true character as its King. He will so far recognize whatever there is of truth in the enthusiasm and hope of His followers. He will dispel whatever was false and earthly by the manner of His entrance, by its startling contrast with their expectations. As if to make that lesson sink deep into their hearts, the two disciples who were closest friends, and therefore brought for a moment into rivalry,—one asking, "What shall we have?" and the other praying that he might sit at the Lord's right hand in His kingdom,—are sent to make the preparations for that unwarlike, unconquering entry.[3] There are traces

[1] John xii. 42. [2] Matt. xxvi. 6; Mark xiv. 3; John xii. 2.

[3] "Two of the disciples" here, in Matt. xxi. 1; Mark xi. 1; Luke xix. 29. But the fact that Peter and John were sent afterwards on a like errand makes it probable that they were chosen for this task also (Luke xxii. 8).

even here of disciples whom the three evangelists scrupulously refrain from mentioning, as they refrain from mentioning Lazarus, who facilitate the progress, and supply the ass and the colt now, as they do afterwards the guest-chamber for the passover.[1] So for the first and the last time, He accepts the homage of the multitude, and the palm-branches are waved, and the garments are cast upon the ground, as Hosannas rend the air, and the cry is heard, "Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord." Once again the hopes of men were revived. Even Gentile strangers, drawn by reverential wonder, sought to see Him; and in their coming, as the firstfruits of the great multitude whom He, being lifted up, should

[1] This seems the natural inference from the facts. Entire strangers would hardly have acknowledged the right of the Nazarene prophet to seize what belonged to them for His own use, at a time when the Sanhedrim were threatening His adherents with excommunication. As it is, the words "The Lord hath need of him," are accepted as a pass-word, and the place is marked out with the precision of a preconcerted plan (Mark xi. 3, 4). So in the parallel instance of the guest-chamber for the passover, St. Matthew (xxvi. 18) uses a mode of speech (πρὸς τὸν δεῖνα) which implies that the name was known, but kept back. The "man bearing a pitcher of water" suggests the thought of an appointed signal. The disciples are to speak of their Master (ὁ διδάσκαλος) as to a fellow-disciple who would recognize His authority. None but such an one, we may add, would have incurred so great a risk. Even more than this, the owner of the "guest-chamber" was one to whom the words "My time is at hand" had a significance which the disciples were slow to apprehend. Taking all the facts together, what seems most probable is, that here, also, St. John's Gospel explains the facts of the other three, and that the host who thus received Him was one of the Nicodemus class of true but not bold adherents among the wealthier Jews.

one day draw to Himself, He saw that the hour was come when the Son of Man should be glorified.[1]

I need not speak fully of the familiar history of that week. What is, perhaps, less familiar to our thoughts is the close connexion, at once of parallelism and contrast, between it and that of the first passover of His ministry. He reproduces, in almost identical form, His protest against the desecration of the Temple, and thus revives the recollection of the words which had then been spoken, and so furnishes the groundwork of the charge against Him.[2] The policy suggested by Caiaphas of conciliating the Romans by sacrificing one in whom the people hailed their king and leader, showed itself in the revival of that coalition between the Pharisees and the Herodians, which had begun almost in the earliest stage of antagonism in the synagogue at Capernaum.[3] The presence of the Tetrarch himself accounts for the activity of his partisans, who hitherto had not taken any part in the conflict at Jerusalem. They seek to entangle Him in the charge of stirring up the people to refuse payment of tribute, on the one hand, or of a recognition of their subjugation on the other. If we place the narrative of the woman taken in adultery

[1] John xii. 20, 21.

[2] John ii. 13—19; Matt. xxi. 12—16; xxvi. 61.

[3] Matt. xxii. 16.

as belonging to this period of the history,—part, as it were, of Luke xxi.,[1]—they seek to force upon Him the like dilemma of either authorizing a capital punishment at a time when they were ostentatiously proclaiming that it was not lawful for them to put any man to death; or else seeming to set aside the law of Moses, and encourage levity of morals. In both cases He baffles the plot, and in the latter puts the agents in it to an open and unexpected shame. The Sadducee followers of the High Priest join in the attack, rejoicing apparently in the opportunity of wounding their old opponents and the new Teacher at one and the same blow. The moderate, vacillating

[1] The balance of evidence is unquestionably against the appropriateness of the present position of the history. Among the other places in which it is found in MSS., *sc.*, after John vii. 36, in John x., at the close of St. John's Gospel, and at the end of Luke xxi.,—the last seems, on internal grounds, every way the fittest. But if we think of it as occurring at this period, it is clear that it takes its place, side by side with the denunciations of Matt. xxiii., among the causes that embittered the enmity of the scribes. The words which speak of them as neglecting "judgment and mercy," as "full of extortion and incontinence," "full of hypocrisy and lawlessness," receive a fresh significance in connexion with it. We do not need the singular addition of one uncial MS., that our Lord wrote on the ground the special sin of each of the woman's accusers, to account for their confusion and their rage. The suggestion in *Ecce Homo*, p. 104, that He stooped down, and wrote on the earth, as if to hide the burning sense of shame and indignation at the shamelessness and heartlessness of the scribes, seems somewhat too much tinged with a modern sentimentalism. A more probable explanation of the act is found in the rabbinic custom of writing on the sand with which the floor of the school was strewn, the chief lesson which their scholars had to learn. He was called upon to act as a judge,—perhaps, by implication, as a king. He shows that He will not assume that office, but will confine Himself to His work as a Teacher and a Prophet.

party seem willing, as before, to recognize Him as a teacher sent from God, whose views as to the primary commandment of the Law are at one with theirs.[1] One result of this combination is, to bring down upon their heads a yet more terrible denunciation of their hypocrisy, selfishness, formalism, dishonesty, than they had yet heard.[2] The Prophet against whom they are plotting appeals from them to the common people whom they despise. Up to this point the schemes of the Caiaphas party have failed, and the people still crowd round Him, and look to Him as at least a prophet. The treachery of the disciple in whom love of gold, and wounded pride, and desire of revenge had crushed the faith and love which had given him a place among the Twelve, and made him for a time a vessel of election, comes in as an unexpected help.[3] The schemes were soon laid. On the Paschal night, when the great mass of the people would be each family in its own house, while the Prophet of Nazareth, after His wont, withdrew to the tranquillity of Gethsemane, they, with the temple police at their disposal, and assisted by a small band of Roman soldiers, make their way to the place of

[1] Matt. xxii. 15—40; Mark xii. 13—34; Luke xx. 20.

[2] Matt. xxiii.

[3] On the character and motives of Judas, see article "Judas," in the *Dictionary of the Bible*.

His retirement.[1] The usual salutation of the disciple to the Master is the signal of betrayal, and the capture is accomplished.

Then comes the hurried summons of the Sanhedrim, and, while its members are assembling, the preliminary interrogation by Annas, in the hope of leading the prisoner to criminate Himself.[2] The council itself is either of set purpose a packed meeting,—those only being summoned who are in the secret of the plot,—or else is practically rendered so by the absence of the leading members of the more moderate party.[3] The accusations take the old form. He has said that He will destroy the temple. The narrative suggests the thought that the more timid or temporizing raised objections to the evidence in detail, and hoped in that way to avoid complicity in any violent measure[4] against Him. The scheme seemed on the point of

[1] Admitting fully the difficulties which encompass the chronological question here, I adopt this solution as the simplest and most natural.

[2] John xviii. 13.

[3] Nicodemus, *e.g.*, was a "ruler," and Joseph of Arimathæa a "counsellor." Neither of them consented to the "counsel and deed" of the Sanhedrim (Luke xxiii. 50, 51), and yet the sentence of condemnation was passed unanimously (Mark xiv. 64). And they, we may well believe, were the representatives of others, the "chief rulers" of John xii. 42, who believed but had not courage to confess.

[4] This, again, is the natural inference from the facts recorded. The Caiaphas party were not likely to have called attention to the discrepancies of evidence which they had themselves suborned, and which helped on their designs. Yet even when two told the same tale, there were some present who called attention to minute circumstantial differences in their statements (Mark xiv. 57—59).

failing. It was reserved for Caiaphas to turn the whole current of feeling against the accused. Remembering what it was which had roused the feelings of the Pharisees to their utmost frenzy, he put the question, "Art Thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed, the Son of God?"[1] and then the answer came, in which He appropriated that title to Himself, and yet at the same time spoke of Himself as the Son of Man whom Daniel had seen coming in the clouds of heaven.[2] The question had answered its purpose. It had led Him to break through the long silence which had baffled and perplexed them. In the hour of utter loneliness and abandonment He would not abate one jot or tittle of His loftiest claims. The thrill of horror, the rending of the clothes, the cry of blasphemy, were the prelude of the sentence that He deserved death.

But the presence of the Roman procurator at

[1] So far as we can read the character of Caiaphas—crafty, worldly, and Sadducæan,—his motive was not the zeal of a devotee, but, as avowed in his counsel to the Sanhedrim (John xi. 49, 50), a mere desire to court the favour of the Roman governor by removing one to whom the multitude looked as to their king. But the claim to be the Christ, taken by itself, was one that many of the Pharisees would have acquiesced in, and few would have felt horror at it. What was needed to rouse them to the white heat of persecution was the identification of the Christ with the Son of God, in the sense in which that name involved oneness of nature and power. This had roused them to attempts on His life before (John v. 18; viii. 59; x. 31), and it did not fail to do so now.

[2] Dan. vii. 13; Matt. xxvi. 64.

Jerusalem prevented their carrying this sentence into effect at once. After a vain attempt to induce Pilate simply to execute their judgment, they find they must get a sentence from the Roman tribunal also, and therefore they prefer their accusation. They of course change the indictment. A Roman procurator would care little whether a teacher called himself Son of Man or Son of God. The charge that He called Himself a king derived some colour from the manner of His entry into Jerusalem; from the fact that in all His teaching He proclaimed a kingdom. They added, in spite of their recent failure to entrap Him, the statement that He had forbidden men to give tribute to Cæsar.[1] Standing outside the official residence of Pilate, while the Prisoner is led within, they bring their accusations, and stir up the people against Him. Some touch of rough pity, some scorn of their baseness, some reverence for the Divine meekness and intense earnestness of the Prisoner who stood before him, led Pilate to snatch at every chance of avoiding the responsibility. Surely Herod will deal with one who is subject to his jurisdiction. Surely the people will accept the liberation of one to whom, a few days

[1] Luke xxiii. 2. The mention of Galilee in connexion with this charge had, of course, a special force. It threatened him with a renewal of the formidable insurrection which had been headed by the Galilæan Judas, and in which the non-payment of tribute had been the watchword of the insurgents.

before, they had shouted Hosannas. The Caiaphas party apparently had foreseen this contingency, and, by stirring up the people to demand the freedom of Barabbas, who had risen in open rebellion against Rome, were able at once to insult Pilate, whom they hated, and to insure the condemnation of the accused.[1] And so their voices prevailed, and Pilate gave sentence that it should be as they required.

I do not follow the history of the Crucifixion. I have purposely abstained from dwelling on all the more personal features of the history to which our minds commonly turn, which have, indeed, the power to "draw all men unto them." I have confined myself to the outside of the history of His ministry, —have dealt with it as one might deal with the history of one of the older prophets of Israel, or with that of a great teacher elsewhere. To have given such a history merely for its own sake, however vivid might be its scenes, however interesting the

[1] Ewald (*Christus*, pp. 41, 480) suggests with much probability that the insurrection in question is identical with that which had been caused by Pilate's attempt to appropriate the *Corban*, or temple treasure, to the construction of an aqueduct (Joseph., *Ant.*, xviii. 3, 2; *B. J.*, ii. 9, 4). The name Bar-Abbas (Son of a Father, *sc.*, a Chief Rabbi) suggests a higher parentage than that of a common robber, and may explain at once his popularity with the people, and the efforts of the ruling class to save him. If we adopt the reading of Matt. xxvii. 16, which gives the name as Jesus Bar-Abbas, the two who were presented by Pilate to the choice of the people bore, by a strange coincidence, the same name, and had to be distinguished by epithets.

movements and combinations of parties in it, would have been to neglect the special work assigned to me. But if I mistake not, the inquiry on which we have entered leads us to some conclusions not without their value, as contributing to strengthen our belief in the truth of the Gospel history as a narrative of facts, and helping us to form a right estimate of their character.

(1.) It will have been seen that there is hardly a single incident related by St. John which does not present an explanation of some facts which otherwise would be obscure, or at least isolated, in the other Gospels. That he wrote with no knowledge of the other three is, I believe, all but demonstrable.[1] That, in the absence of any such knowledge or purpose, his Gospel should be unconsciously at once supplementary and explanatory, filling up gaps and giving the connecting link which unites our Lord's Galilæan ministry with that in Jerusalem, supplies at least some additional evidence in support of the received faith of

[1] It is surely almost inconceivable that the seeming discrepancies between St. John's narrative and that of the other three Gospels, (1) as to the day and (2) as to the hour of the crucifixion, should have been left unexplained by one who was writing, as it has been said, with the other three Gospels before him, and in order to set his seal authoritatively to their testimony. The notion that he, of set purpose, created the difficulties in order to test the faith of his readers, implies a different conception of the character of the beloved disciple from any that I can bring myself to form.

Christendom, and the conclusions of the boldest criticism as to its authorship. It may give us courage, with men like Ewald and Renan, to cut away the cobweb speculations which would assign it not to the beloved disciple, but to an unknown controversialist of the second century. I do not think there is much risk of any one who has capacity for appreciating the spiritual life at all, following the latter of those critics in his estimate of the character of the teaching recorded in that fourth Gospel, or his theory as to the motives of the writer.[1]

(2.) The same method of inquiry has led us also to recognize a true unity in the character and teaching of our Lord throughout the records which the Church preserves. The difference between the three and the fourth is not the result of the interpolation, by the writer of the latter, of his own words and thoughts, as uttered by his Master. It is not more than was *à priori* probable, according as the teaching of our Lord was addressed to men of various degrees of knowledge and spiritual culture, recorded by men of different degrees of receptivity, in books written

[1] "Des tirades prétentieuses, lourdes, mal écrites, disant peu de chose au sens moral . . ." (p. xxx). "Ces discours raides et gauches . . ." (p. xxxiii). "La même rivalité semble poindre dans l'Évangile de Jean, où l'on voit le narrateur declarer sans cesse qu'il a été le 'disciple chéri,' . . . et chercher systématiquement à se placer près de Simon Pierre, parfois à se mettre avant lui" (p. 159).—Renan, *Vie de Jésus*.

for different classes of readers, in different churches, and therefore with a diversity of purpose guiding their selection out of a great mass of material.[1]

(3.) Accepting this unity, we find, from first to last, the same theology, the same claims, the same Divine powers and names asserted by the Teacher of Himself. He is more than any prophet, more than Moses, more than Solomon, more than the angels of heaven, more than the teacher of a human creed, or the founder of a polity of earth.[2] To Him authority has been given to execute judgment, and He will sit upon the throne of His glory, and before Him shall be gathered all nations.[3] To Him all

[1] The difference between the representations of the character and teaching of Socrates, given respectively by Xenophon and Plato, has often been referred to as a parallel, and, to some extent, undoubtedly is so. The plain, soldier-like, yet cultivated intellect took in one phase of his great master's mind; the subtle speculative genius, craving for a knowledge of God, took in another. In some respects, accordingly, they stand to each other in the relation of St. Mark and St. John. Those who would carry the parallelism further, may find something suggestive in the tendency which led Plato at one time into regions in which the highest truth was uttered in language the most remote from the ideas of sense, and at another, as in the myths of the *Gorgias*, the *Phædon*, and the 10th book of the *Republic*, into the most glowing and gorgeous symbolism, reminding us of that of the Apocalypse. The difference, great as it is, between that book and the Gospel and Epistles of St. John, does not necessarily prove diversity of authorship. The question how far Plato introduced elements of his own into his report of his master's teaching, is one on which I need not now enter. It is obvious that this was infinitely more probable, on the wide ground covered by his dialogues, than in the records—measured by mere extent, few and meagre—which have been left us by St. John.

[2] Matt. xii. 42; xix. 8; Mark xiii. 32; Luke xi. 31.

[3] Matt. xxv. 31; John v. 22, 27.

power is committed in heaven and earth. He is the Son of God, in a sense ineffable, transcendent, above all that bear that name or stand in that relationship. He is one with the Father, and the very limitations on absolute equality as to knowledge and power[1] are but proofs of the claim to be of one substance with the Father as the Son of God, even as His name as the Son of Man bears witness that He is of one nature with mankind. The claim is asserted not only in the hour of seeming triumph, but in that of apparently utter failure. It goes together with words of the highest and noblest wisdom, with a character of the purest truthfulness and widest sympathy. It was at least believed by thousands, who were with Him continually, to go together with supernatural powers. Those powers were asserted, unhesitatingly, by Himself.

(4.) It might have been possible, consistently I do not say with belief, but with reverence and pity, to explain these facts, if the history had stopped here. "Here," men might have said, "was one so plunged in the contemplation of the Divine, so absorbed in communion with the Absolute, that He identified Himself with that Divinity which He felt, as a presence and a power, within Him. He passed

[1] Mark xiii. 32; John v. 19.

away as others pass; died as a martyr to what, in the form in which He stated it, was a dream, though it had a shadowy truth which belongs to all men and all times. He lives still in the influence of His thoughts. He taught men how they, in their consciousness, might have fellowship with God." In such a case we might honour Him as we honour the memory of the martyrs and prophets of scientific or other truths; as men who are not of the creed of Islam or of Buddha may yet honour the names of Mahomet and Sakya-Mouni: but there would be no trust in anything He had done for us, no belief in any words He spoke as a revelation of His Father. We should mourn for Him as the women of Israel mourned for Thammuz, as men bewail a glory departed from the earth, a bright promise destined never to be fulfilled.

But there is more than this. The Gospels proclaim, the Church has believed, that, as He died, so He rose again. The Resurrection was that which made His disciples feel that they had not followed cunningly devised fables. The simple faith of children and childlike souls, the acuteness of practised controversialists, have alike turned to this as the crucial instance of the whole inquiry. Given this as a fact, and a seal is set upon the whole life and work of

Christ, the laws which He gave, the theology which He preached, stamping them with nothing less than a Divine authority. Reject this, and our faith is vain, and the life was that of a dreamer self-deceived, and we are yet in our sins, or, at least, if there is no such thing as sin, in our blindness, for no Redeemer, Restorer, Mediator has come to save us. It may be a mistake to substitute the evidence of the Resurrection for all other evidence as to the character of Christ and the narrative of the Gospels, or even to give it precedence in the order of inquiry; but it remains as a question to which every other runs up, and upon the decision of which every other turns.

VIII.

THE RESURRECTION.

VIII.

THE RESURRECTION.

THE apologists of the last century chose the question of the Resurrection as their favourite battle-field.[1] They felt, rightly enough, that if Christ

[1] It is right to add that they did not make their choice unchallenged. It was against this part of the Gospel history that the Deists of the eighteenth century directed their chief attacks, parading all apparent discrepancies, dwelling on the absolute impossibility of such a violation of the laws of nature. The Wolfenbüttel Fragments of Reimarus, though not published till Lessing came upon them in 1774, show clearly enough the kinds of objection which were current during the previous half century among the men of letters who started with an antipathy to Christianity. Leslie's *Short and Easy Method with the Deists*, and Sherlock's *Trial of the Witnesses*, may be mentioned as the most prominent contributions to the apologetic literature of this period. Among those of our own time, Mr. Westcott's masterly treatise on the *Gospel of the Resurrection* deserves the highest place, and is a worthy companion to the volumes in which he, more than most others among us, has fulfilled the condition of bringing forth out of his treasure "things new and old." An able though little known pamphlet (*A Layman's Letters*), written jointly by the two brothers, Julius and Augustus Hare, and published anonymously in 1825, as an answer to the coarse infidelity of the time, deserves a special mention for its terse and effective reasoning, and would be worth reprinting.

had not risen, the faith of Christendom was a delusion; that if this miracle were proved, then no objection on the ground of antecedent improbability could be brought against any other. Their labours were welcomed as triumphant vindications of the truth when they first appeared. They have since been subject to what is, I believe, an undue depreciation. Partly, it may be, this was the natural result of their controversial tone. They spoke and wrote like men holding a brief, and appealing to a jury for a verdict, marring the effect of their argument as a whole by exaggerated language as to special points of evidence, scornful and defiant to those against whom they argued. The two schools of thought which, since their time, have risen into prominence, have had each of them their special reasons for finding this method of defence distasteful. To those who saw in the existence of the Church, with a Divine life as the token of a Divine authority, the one sufficient evidence to which men ought to bow, this scrutiny of circumstantial testimony, this appeal to the judgment of common men in dealing with it, seemed to lower the grounds of belief, to substitute a hesitating assent for an implicit faith, to encourage the habit of a sceptical inquiry. This examination of the witnesses might lead to a cross-

examination. Minute discrepancies, real or apparent, might be made much of, and men's faith be shaken instead of strengthened by the inquiry. At the best, such a line of defence did not lead men beyond the cold level of Unitarianism. By dwelling on the Resurrection simply as a fact, a miracle itself in attestation of other miracles, it hindered them from rising to the higher truths that gathered round it. Side by side with this, there has been a growing tendency with many thinkers, who have not cast off their reverence for Christianity, to take, if they can, its ideas without its facts, to disentangle it from its supernatural surroundings, and present the human character of Christ, and His ethical teaching, as sufficient for a world-wide religion. The tendency shows itself in different forms and degrees; sometimes in a mere disparagement of the evidence on which belief in the Resurrection has been made to rest; sometimes in the assumption that the narrative, if true, must be self-evident, as meeting men's hopes and wishes; sometimes, and in its extremest forms, in rationalistic explanations of the apparent death and apparent resurrection,[1] or in substituting for the truth that

[1] Such, *e. g.*, was that which Paulus maintained, as applicable both to the instances in which our Lord is said to have restored others to life and to His own resurrection—the theory of a suspended animation, restored for a short time, and permitting intercourse with His disciples. In one form of this hypothesis

Christ has risen, the immortality of His influence, and the onward progress of mankind.[1]

In the belief that those who need to lay once again the foundation of their own faith, or are called on to deal with the doubts, latent or avowed, of others, will find in the inquiry whether Christ did indeed rise, that which will meet their wants, and lead them on, in union with other inquiries, to fuller and clearer conviction, I suggest some thoughts which bear upon it.

1. It will be scarcely questioned that of all forms which a new religion could have assumed, when the first preachers of the Christian faith did their work, the most startling and unexpected was that of a society of men bound together by their belief, not in a future resurrection of mankind, but in the past

the life was prolonged in obscurity for many years, and the manifestation to Saul of Tarsus, on the way to Damascus, was a solitary recorded instance of reappearance. These, of course, are not the theories with which we have to deal now; but it is instructive to note them as landmarks in the history of unbelief.

[1] Compare the conclusion of the first edition of Strauss's *Leben Jesu:*—"Humanity it is that dies, and rises again, and ascends to Heaven. . . . Through faith in this Christ, specially in His death and resurrection, man is justified before God."

Such, also, appears to have been the hope to which the faith of one of the most gifted minds of our time rose as from yet a lower abyss of unbelief.

> "Though died, not dead;
> Not gone, though fled;
> Not lost, though vanished.
> In the great Gospel, and true creed,
> He is yet risen indeed,
> Christ is yet risen."—*A. H. Clough.*

resurrection of One whom they owned as their Lord. No religion of the past had rested on that foundation, and whatever shadowy dreams of a victory over Hades had clothed themselves in mythical form, as in the legends of Osiris, or Hercules, or Theseus, or Orpheus, they had fallen into contempt, and were practically believed by none. The denial of any immortality had, as my immediate predecessor has shown,[1] become not only the current thought of most men, but the avowed principle of lawgivers and statesmen. To have met that denial by the usual arguments for the immortality of the soul,—its own intuitive convictions, its passionate yearnings, the witness of conscience, the testimony of mankind,—would have been natural enough; and we find poets and philosophers appealing to them.[2] But the preachers of the Christian faith came with quite

[1] Merivale's Boyle Lectures on the Conversion of the Empire, Lect. 1.

[2] It would be idle to quote the well-known passages in which the belief was thus maintained; but it is instructive to note how apologetic the tone is throughout, as of men maintaining an obsolescent doctrine against a growing scepticism. The unbelief of which Juvenal wrote—

"Esse aliquid Manes, et subterranea regna

. . . . .

Nec pueri credunt,"—*Sat.* ii. 149.

was of long standing. Tacitus, hoping against hope, could not rise above "Si quis piorum manibus locus, neque omnino intereunt magnæ animæ." (*Agric.* c. 46.) But in the days in which Christianity achieved its victories the case was even worse. Belief in immortality, as the language of the speakers in the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix shows, had ceased to be a probable

another line of argument than that. They bore their witness, "Christ has risen; therefore man shall rise." They chose what appeared to those who heard it, not the dream of a philosopher, but the delusion of a madman. It was when Paul preached Jesus and His resurrection that the Epicureans and Stoics spoke of him as a "babbler,"[1] or the "setter forth of foreign divinities." The multitude listened to him as he preached on Mars' Hill till he said that God had raised Jesus from the dead, and then "some mocked."[2] When he stood before Festus and Agrippa, the Roman heard him till he spoke of Christ as the first that had risen from the dead, and then scornfully interrupted him—"Thou art beside thyself. Thy much learning doth make thee mad."[3]

opinion, which poets or philosophers might legitimately hold without loss of reputation. It had brought with it the stigma of an imbecile enthusiasm. Those who hold it "mendaciis credunt," are "errore decepti," the victims of a "dementia."—*Octav.* c. 11.

[1] As we read the words of Acts xvii. 18, "Because he preached unto them Jesus, and the resurrection," they at first suggest the thought that the latter word refers to the doctrine of the general resurrection of mankind. Interpreted, however, by the speech that follows, "He hath appointed a day, in which He will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom He hath ordained; whereof He hath given assurance unto all men, in that He hath raised Him from the dead," they show that the historical fact of *the* Resurrection was what he dwelt on as a proof of the Divine authority of the Man who had been so raised. The notion that St. Paul could so have preached that the word *anastasis* would fall on the ears of men as the name of a new deity whom they were to worship, has nothing to support it in any extant record of his teaching.

[2] Acts xvii. 32.

[3] Acts xxvi. 23, 24.

What was in the strictest sense of the term a paradox was, however, received, and the Church of Christ rested on it, and lived in it. It would be idle to pretend that all who thus accepted it, even in the first stage of their conversion, went through any critical investigation of evidence, and were led by it to their conclusion. St. Paul, and others like him, might tell of the times and circumstances in which Christ had shown Himself after His resurrection; the Twelve, where they went and preached, might testify of their own personal and direct knowledge; but we find no trace, in the records of the New Testament or elsewhere, of that slow process of balancing evidence, checking independent testimonies, and the like, which we include in the idea of investigation. They did not send out a body of commissioners to Palestine to sift evidence and draw up a report. Men were won to the truth which was at first so incredible, by the manifest earnestness, the intense truthfulness, the heroic self-sacrifice of those who preached it; by their power to read the secrets of men's hearts, and meet the wants of their inner life; in some cases, if we accept a wide-spread testimony, by the power which accompanied that, of healing bodily diseases.[1]

[1] I do not refer, in arguing with doubt or unbelief, to the narratives of a book like *The Acts of the Apostles*, the authority of which has been denied.

2. We are thrown back, then, on the belief of those first preachers. What led them to a life so full of suffering and labour, so destructive of old ties and inherited expectations; separating them from their countrymen, exposing them to the scorn of the heathen? Were they, the disciples of the Crucified, the Twelve, the Hundred and twenty, the Five Hundred,[1]—were they the victims of a self-deluding dream? Had their eager expectations wrought simultaneously upon all of them, till they embodied themselves in a uniform belief? Was the report, once doubted by them as an "idle tale," the foundation of the faith of Christendom? Did a woman's momentary hallucination fix the creed of millions for ages? Was Mary of Magdala the foundress of Christianity?[2] The answer is, that the records, in which

It is legitimate, however, to follow Paley (*Hor. Paul.*, c. xvi., § 7) in pointing out the incidental way in which the language of St. Paul implies a far wider employment of supernatural power than the narrative of his companion puts on record. "Gifts of healing" take their place among the *charismata*, side by side with prophecy, wisdom, knowledge (1 Cor. xii. 1—11). "Signs, and wonders, and powers" are referred to, as proofs of his apostolic authority, (2 Cor. xii. 12), in writing to a Church where, if we had only St. Luke's narrative, we should be led to think of faith having come without them. He appeals to the memory of the Galatians as attesting the fact that he had "wrought miracles (*δυνάμεις*) among them" (Gal. iii. 5).

[1] Acts i. 15. The words of St. Peter (i. 22) imply that all alike fulfilled the condition of having been "witnesses of the resurrection," and so far coincide with St. Paul's statement as to the larger number (1 Cor. xv. 6).

[2] This is what M. Renan puts forward as the adequate interpretation of the

there is, *primâ facie* at least, one token of truthfulness (human nature, as such, delighting to show itself clear-sighted and sagacious), show that here also there was no expectation. The Resurrection was for the disciples themselves a paradox. It found them in an attitude of blank despondency, and a sorrow that stupefied them. They had forgotten every word which had held out the hope of a resurrection. It was not till the fact had forced itself upon them that they remembered and understood the sayings, clear or dark, which had predicted it. Not even the teaching that immediately preceded the crucifixion had impressed it on their thoughts. They had not as yet learnt to look on it as the necessary or natural fulfilment of any prophecy. As it was, the crucifixion seemed to them the end of their Master's work. They, men and women alike, were thinking of the burial, and of nothing else.[1] They trusted that it had been He

facts (*Les Apôtres*, p. 13). Ewald, in marked contrast with him, free as is his handling of the documents of Jewish and Christian history, strange as may be his conception of the Resurrection itself, speaks of the fact as one "than which nothing can be more historical."—*Gesch. Israels.*, vi. p. 69.

[1] The statement of St. Matthew (xxvii. 63), that the priests and Pharisees remembered what the disciples seem to have forgotten, has often been spoken of as among the improbable—almost incredible—circumstances of the Gospel record. Those who take this view of it forget two things—(1) that the words in which the disciples afterwards learnt to see a prophecy of the resurrection had recently been brought before the Sanhedrim (Matt. xxvi. 61; Mark xiv. 58), and that some of them, accustomed as they were to figurative speech, might

which should have redeemed Israel.[1] When the women first ran to bear their report to the eleven, they believed them not.[2] One disciple held out in his incredulity against the testimony of the other ten.[3] I do not say, as some have done, that the evidence of the Resurrection of Christ is the same in kind, or degree, as that of the great facts of the outward history of the world, for He "showed Himself not to all the people, but to chosen witnesses alone."[4] But the witness was borne, and the belief spread, not, as one has written,—

> "As circulates in some great city's crowd,
> A rumour changeful, vague, importunate and loud,
> From no determined centre, or of fact
> Or authorship exact,"—

easily have entered into the meaning with which they had been spoken; and (2) that this superior discernment has its parallel, as we have seen (p. 234), in their recognition of tendencies in our Lord's teaching which the disciples did not apprehend. It may be added, that as St. Matthew and St. Mark (xii. 38, 39; xvi. 1—4: viii. 11, 12) report them, the most distinct prediction by our Lord of His coming resurrection was made to scribes, Pharisees, and Sadducees. Men may, if they like, reject the narrative as incredible, on the ground that the supernatural is impossible, but it is, at any rate, coherent.

[1] Luke xxiv. 21. [2] Luke xxiv. 11.

[3] John xx. 24, 25. The history of the unbelief of Thomas, and of the change which turned it into adoration, has a naturalness and power which carry conviction with them, and has helped to strengthen the faith of many noble and earnest minds, (Arnold's is, perhaps, the most conspicuous example,—compare Stanley's *Life*, i. p. 142); but we often fail, I believe, to recognize what it implies,—that the incredulity of the one apostle had been shared by the others, and that his words contain an implied rebuke of their inconsistency.

[4] Acts x. 41. Mr. Westcott (*Gospel of the Resurrection*, p. 119), and Ewald (*Gesch., Israels*, vi. p. 69), avoid the exaggerated language of some older and

but from men named and conspicuous, whose oscillations of doubt and belief are vividly portrayed, whose first act, when they were left to themselves, was to fill up the vacant place with one who, with them, should be a witness of the Resurrection.[1] What but the fact itself can explain that life-long martyrdom? What need was there for it if they had been only the preachers of a purer ethics than that of the scribes and Pharisees? Would not the words of a prophet, who had died for the truth, have had hold enough on their reverence and love?

3. When the disciples stand forth before the scribes and people to proclaim the Resurrection, they appeal to a twofold evidence: "We are witnesses of these things," they say: but then they add, "So is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey Him:"[2] "Being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, He hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear."[3] There was a new life in the disciples. Instead of timid cowardice, and confused thought, and faltering speech, there were unwavering boldness, clear intelligence, wonderful

later apologists, while they urge, with equal clearness and force, the adequacy of the evidence.

[1] Acts i. 22. [2] Acts v. 32. [3] Acts ii. 33.

gifts of utterance. This is the explanation they give of a change which all might take note of. Over and above the wonder (whatever may have been its nature) of the gift of tongues,[1] there was the power to read men's hearts, to speak burning words, to open the meaning of psalm and prophecy, with a discernment of inner and mystic meanings which startled the rabbis of Jerusalem. The fishermen of Galilee, with no rabbinic training, and holding no office in synagogue or school (*ἀγράμματοι καὶ ἰδιῶται*), stood forth as rivals of Hillel or Gamaliel.[2] There was a new power breaking through the order of the world's routine, and those in whom it worked most actively did not boast of it as a special and peculiar privilege. They proclaimed its universality as spreading far and wide, embracing those whom the traditions of later Judaism looked on as outside the circle of spiritual activity—women and slaves;[3] and they connected their own possession of it, and that which they invited others to test by actual experience,[4] with the fact of which they declared themselves eye-witnesses, that their Lord had risen from the dead and had ascended into heaven. Hardly less mighty

[1] I have endeavoured to discuss this question, with as much fulness as the space allowed me admitted, in the *Dictionary of the Bible*, art. "Tongues, Gift of."

[2] Acts iv. 13. [3] Acts ii. 17, 18. [4] Acts ii. 38.

in its effect than the new powers they thus acquired, was the new life which accompanied them,—the life of truth, meekness, purity, self-renunciation which distinguished at least the first days of the Church of Christ, and removed it to an infinite distance from the sects and factions of Judaism.[1] So far as the members of that Church testified to a fact, it made their evidence trustworthy.[2] So far as they looked to that fact as the foundation of their society, and the spring and source of their life, even when they were not directly witnesses of it, their new life itself, as a resurrection from the death of sin, gave proof of the power of the belief for good, strengthening men's hopes, nerving them in their warfare against evil. That power it has had ever since, bringing life and immortality to light, giving an assurance of a victory over death and over evil, cheering the sorrowful, strengthening the weak. We must take a strangely pessimist view of the moral order of the world, if we suppose that the highest work which has

[1] Acts ii. 42—47; iv. 32—35.

[2] It will be admitted that such a life, and the character which it implies, excludes the idea of wilful deception from self-interested motives. If it leaves an opening, as the example of monastic communities shows that it does, for the ready reception of alleged supernatural incidents, it must be remembered that it is one thing for such reports to gain currency when the life is established and the expectation roused, and quite another for them to be the foundation of the life itself, the starting-point of a great change in feelings, habits, and convictions.

ever been done in it by any creed or society has had its root in a delusion or a fraud. Do men gather grapes from thorns?

4. At the risk of seeming inconsistent with myself, I point to a belief that had in it some element of uncertainty, and even error, as part of the indirect evidence of the fact of the Resurrection. Everywhere throughout the apostolic age we find the belief that the coming of the Lord was nigh. The times and the seasons were hid from men; and even apostles were left to know in part and prophesy in part, and lived and died in the belief that though they could fix nothing, and though there might be a long interval of years or centuries, yet also that the second Advent might be close at hand. The thought coloured all their language. It determined, in part at least, their family relationships.[1] What we have

[1] That the apostles and their disciples were expecting the second coming of Christ in their own time, though they were guarded by a wisdom higher than their own from fixing the day or year, can hardly be said to admit of question. "*We* that are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not get the start of those that sleep" (1 Thess. iv. 15). "Waiting for the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. i. 7). "The dead shall be raised incorruptible, and *we* shall be changed" (1 Cor. xv. 52). "Be patient, therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord" (James v. 7). Even in the passage which throws back the expectation of an immediate advent, what seems contemplated is a rapid series of portentous changes crowded into the space of a lifetime (2 Thess. ii. 3—13); the revelation of the "man of sin," the working of the mystery of iniquity, the coming of the Lord to destroy the "lawless one" with the brightness of His presence, not the slow unfolding of the Church's life through a long series of centuries. This was, indeed, the natural result of the language in

to note in this is, that the belief always presupposes the Resurrection and the Ascension as known and undisputed facts. They are not looking forward, as men have looked forward to the return of Arthur, or Nero, or St. John, as to the return of one from the shadow world of the dead. They are not trusting to a future victory. Everywhere their language is that the Lord will descend from heaven; that the heavens must receive Him till the time of the restitution of all things; that He who died, and *rose again*, will come to be the Judge of the quick and dead. Is it conceivable that the expectation should have taken precisely this form, unless it had rested on the fact of the Resurrection, received as such on direct personal testimony, or adequate attestation of another kind?

We are hardly yet, it may be, in a position to estimate the tendencies which have led men in our own age, or in that of our fathers, to doubt or deny what

which our Lord Himself had blended the two things together,—wars and rumours of wars in Judæa, the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple, and the coming of the Son of Man sitting on the clouds of heaven. Even when experience had altered, as it were, the perspective of the future in their eyes, and they had learnt to meet fevered eagerness or mocking taunt with the thought that "one day with the Lord was as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day" (2 Pet. iii. 8), it was still with the feeling that men were to be not only "expecting the coming of the Lord," but "hastening it" by their holiness and activity (2 Pet. iii. 12). Even the Apocalypse—though we have learnt to interpret it differently—suggested, in its literal meaning, the thought of months and days (Rev. xi. 2, 3) rather than of centuries.

was once so universally received. Partly, it may be, there is here, as in the case of other miracles, the pseudo-scientific dogmatism which postulates the impossibility of anything that it cannot group and classify under its generalization, which does not come within the laws of the succession which it has observed and labelled. Partly there may be the spirit of historical scepticism, which accepts no fact except on evidence which is faultless, systematic, harmonious; which will not see, in seeming anomalies or contradictions, proofs at least of independence, and refuses to take account of the indirect evidence of character, life, wide-spread conviction, harmony of fact with teaching, the Church's supernatural life, the effect of time in sweeping away delusions and leaving the *fact* upon a rock. But much more than this, I believe we may look to two causes, working in various degrees at all times, working with special intensity in our own. (1.) The root of the only unbelief which we dare condemn has been laid bare for us. "Men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil."[1] In its darker and more open forms that connexion is often apparent still. Where we find it so, what is needed is not the balancing of evidence, the array of coincidences and

[1] John iii. 19.

the like ; but the appeal to the conscience, which, when roused into activity, makes it impossible for the man to continue any longer indifferent to the light, and compels him either to yield to it or to hate it. Men shrink from the Resurrection of Christ, because it gives the assurance of One who shall judge the world in righteousness ; and they fear to face that judgment. They can drug and stupefy conscience when it reproves them for brutal passion or refined selfishness, as long as life lasts, and they endeavour to persuade themselves that Christ is not risen, because then they may rest in the belief that there is no resurrection from the dead. There are also many, I believe, on whom we dare not pass this condemnation,—not the slaves of sense, nor worshippers of mammon,—often protesting, with an almost martyr-like boldness, against the world's wrong,—active, with the highest activity, in social or political reforms,—who yet neither accept the historical fact of Christ's resurrection, nor look forward to a resurrection for mankind. For them man's craving for immortality is satisfied by the perpetuity of influence, or the perfectibility of the race. The "individual withers, but the world is more and more." The feeling shows itself in many forms. Now we hear the proclamation that "the last enemy that shall be destroyed is not death, but the

belief of immortality."[1] Now the highest praise bestowed on one who bore sharp agony with a patient endurance, is that "he never for one moment consoled or cheated himself with the belief in a hereafter."[2] Now (human affection, let us hope, rather than hollow sentimentalism, struggling against the dogmatism of denial) the advocate of a system which rejects that belief turns to one whom he has loved as "reposing in the bosom of God," and able to reveal to him the truth which she sees clearly.[3] Now the prophet of a philosophy which leaves the religious stage of thought far behind it as rude and elementary, invents a new worship, and takes the relics of one whom he has revered as objects of adoration.[4] What is common to all of them—far more widely spread than we are willing to acknowledge—is the shrinking from the perpetuity of personal existence. Men are weary of their life, weary of it even when it is most active in its energy, or when they minister most assiduously to the satisfaction of its appetites. That energy and that satisfaction may make it just endurable; but the thought of a perpetuation of conscious life when they are no longer within reach, has not only no attraction for men, but positively repels them. A system which

[1] Strauss, *Leben Jesu* (1st edition).
[2] *Ibid.*, p. xi.
[3] Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, p. ii.
[4] Comte.

excludes the personality of God finds its consciousness of a human personality an intolerable burden.

The religion of three hundred millions of the human race bears witness how easily men of very varying nationalities may sink into this state of feeling, and what fruits it bears. The whole system of Buddhism is based on this shrinking from immortality, this exclusion of the thought of God. It has proved itself to be compatible with a highly developed ritual, with priestly power, monastic institutions, the recognition of the brotherhood of mankind, bounty for the poor, confession of sins, reverence for humanity.[1] If we wish to forecast the future of the Christendom without a Christ, the *cultus* without a God, to which the thoughts of many seem to be tending, we may see it in the history of the creed of Buddha. Of all the religions of heathenism it

[1] A comparison of the two systems is forced upon us, in part, by the extent and duration of Buddhism, in part also by the closing words of M. Renan's *Vie de Jésus*. When he speaks his last and highest word of panegyric, it is this :—"Il n'y a pas eu d'homme, *Çakya Mouni peut-être excepté*, qui ait à ce point foulé aux pieds la famille, les joies de ce monde, tout soin temporel" (p. 458). I have not now time to carry the inquiry into the points of contrast or resemblance in the two systems further, but I cannot conceal my conviction that the position of Gotama Buddha in the religious history of mankind, and the influence of his teaching in the West as well as in the East, for centuries before as well as after the Christian æra, have not as yet been discussed with even an approach to completeness. Valuable as are Mr. Hardy's and M. St. Hilaire's treatises, they do not fill up the gap. Even Dr. Rowland Williams's masterly Essay on *Christianity and Hinduism* leaves some questions undiscussed.

offers, in many respects, the closest parallelism to the faith of the Christian Church. If the Life on which that Church rests be no more than the life of a devout reformer, of which we know but little, and that little overlaid with legends, then the history of the founder of Buddhism has scarcely a less claim to our reverence. That, too, tells of a wonderful humility and self-renunciation; of the expansion of human sympathy beyond all limits of race or caste; of purity and voluntary poverty; of devotion to the task of saving a lost world, and propagating the religion that was to save it, not by force, but by the mere power of preaching and example. That in which Buddhism differs essentially from the faith of Christendom, is precisely that in which it comes nearest to the tone of feeling and thought into which we seem to be gliding,—the negation of a Divine Will; the weariness of life; the scepticism as to all but the phænomena of sensation, which are prevalent around us. Christ came to reveal to men a Father, and His own human character was the witness of that Father's will. Buddhism taught men that by self-culture they might attain to an identification of themselves with a supreme impersonal Intelligence. Christianity came with the promise of eternal life, the life of knowing God. Buddhism offered, as modern thought tends to

offer, annihilation as the crown of all things; not-knowing and not-being, as the object of all desires and hopes, the reward of all strivings after activity in good. And in this respect Buddhism, if not the nobler or the truer in its teaching, has, in the very falsehood with which it started, an ethical power over men which its modern analogues cannot claim. Our systems can only boast that they deliver men from the belief in immortality. The strength of Buddhism lay in its starting with the assumption of a natural immortality,—existence perpetuated, though not with a conscious identity, through all forms of life; each with the inevitable evils of all finite being, often with those evils in accumulated measure. Appealing to that weariness of life which has always found utterance wherever life has been degraded, it offered its *Nirwana*, its annihilation, as the reward of patient continuance in well-doing, and so, at least, presented a motive to that continuance. Modern materialism assumes a *Nirwana*, the negation of all conscious being, as the natural, inevitable end of all; and failing to appeal either to the conscience as witnessing to a law, or to the fear or the love of God, whom it declares to be unknowable, it leaves men only to the calculation of lower pleasures and pains, and tends to a greater depth of degradation than Buddhism

itself. And it will prove itself, as that system has done, incompatible with freedom, progress, purity, tending, as did the Epicureanism of the early Empire, —itself a system without faith and without hope,— to make men acquiesce in despotism, tainting with its touch the noblest energies in art, or poetry, or thought.

(2.) Yet another cause of the unbelief with which we have to contend may be found, we must confess it with shame, in the history of the Christian Church, in the present state of Christendom. The thought that "Christ is not risen indeed" has come to many a mind, not as the logical conclusion of any scrutiny of evidence, or *à priori* assumption of the impossibility of a miracle, but from comparing what they actually see with what ought to have been, if that Resurrection were believed. They pass through the "sinful streets" of our cities, or look out upon the dark places of the earth. They read the record of the controversies of the Christian Church, and see its divisions now, and the chill of disappointment comes over them as they witness its apparent failure to overcome the evils of the world. It is not difficult, of course, for the apologist to return an answer to such men. "They are looking for what was never promised. This ideal was always as remote as it is now. The Church, from

the beginning, was divided and distracted, the tares were mingled with the wheat. It was impossible but that offences should come. The evidence of facts remains unaffected by the failure of those facts to produce results which we had no right to look for." All this is true, and a thinker who wished to be more than a dreamer would do well to take it into account. And yet it is also true that in proportion as Christian men fall short of the greatness of their calling, and the Church fails of her completeness and her unity, we lack that element of moral proof which goes straight to men's hearts, and which was at the outset of her life the secret of her success. Then the risen life, the citizenship in heaven, the mystical and yet most real participation of Christians in the crucifixion, burial, resurrection, ascension of their Master, were signs and tokens of the power, and therefore of the reality, of that Resurrection and Ascension. Wherever that witness has been given with like power since, it has borne like fruits. Our lower aims and poorer lives; our abounding and ever-growing luxury, while millions are left to perish in the most brutal degradation; our wide-spread worship of mere material prosperity; our devotion to the thousand forms, refined or unrefined, of the merely sensuous life,—these form an impediment in the

way of true and living faith which the doubter finds it difficult to surmount, and over which the apologist must well-nigh weep for shame. He feels that in marshalling arguments and answering objections he is often only beating the air. One stirring appeal, by one whose life gives him a right to make it, to the hearts and conscience of men, may do more than many books of evidences. The axe is laid to the root of the tree of unbelief, when one who is a follower of Paul as he was of Christ, bears his witness that Christ has been revealed in him, and reasons of "righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come," till Felix trembles.

So it may yet be that the craving after the unity of Christendom, whether it succeeds in attaining any outward result or not, may help men to resist, or, better still, to win over, those who, consciously or unconsciously, are doing what in them lies to rob Christendom of its Christ. We may be led to feel that that prayer which He offered for His Church, and the answer to which seems so far off from its fulfilment, the prayer that "all might be one,"[1]—one with the same marvellous unity as that which binds together the Father and the Son,—cannot be fulfilled till we walk more in His footsteps, strive

[1] John xvii. 21.

more earnestly to be conformed to His likeness. Not by taking the formulæ of a time of hottest controversy as a basis of union, and then "explaining to the uttermost;" not by fighting old battles over again, or waging a new warfare against new combatants with the animosity of those older conflicts; not by a mere suspension of hostilities, and a league, offensive and defensive, against those we look on as a common foe, shall we approximate to unity, but by reproducing His gentleness and meekness, His purity and patience, His unworldliness and life of sacrifice. So in our oneness of aim, purpose, law, we may at least mitigate the differences of thought, feeling, ritual, which still divide us, bearing the infirmities of the weak, not pleasing ourselves. We may be content in many things to wait, where we ourselves are still perplexed, till all things shall be made plain; may cease to demand assent from others who are in perplexity. It may be that the very effort will, for each who makes it, enable him to see the light more clearly, for whosoever "will do the will of His Father, the same shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God."[1] It may be that as the king of Judah once heard the word of God even from the mouth of an Egyptian invader,[2] so the divided Churches of

[1] John vii. 17.

[2] 2 Chron. xxxv. 21, 22.

Christendom may profit even by the teaching that comes from those who are outside all Churches.

The work before us calls for patience and forbearance. It calls also for the courage that does not shrink from facing difficulties, for the discernment which looks before and after, and does not fear to acknowledge the errors of the past in order that it may meet the emergencies of the present and the future. The worship of more than one-half of the Christian Church has turned with a concentrated devotion to the beginning and the end of the human life of the Son of God. The visible representations of the Child and the Madonna, of the Christ upon the cross, have received a homage, idolatrous certainly in its accompaniments, almost in its essence, and any true reform must begin with reverence indeed for the past, but also with the courage which can reject the most revered and ancient symbols. Even the brazen serpent had to be cast aside as a Nehushtan. Even the crucifix may stand between the soul of man and the true power of the cross of Christ; and the form of the infant Jesus may hinder men from apprehending, as they should do, His true and perfect humanity. And the same process, we must not shrink from admitting it, may be wanted elsewhere. We need, not an iconoclastic warfare against what seems

to us the idolatry of others, but to cast the idols which we have made, "each one for himself to worship," to the moles and to the bats. Those who are most zealous in their warfare against an outward symbolism may find their Nehushtan in the words which they have made their idol, phrases which have lost their meaning, formulæ from which the life has gone, theories which can only be supported by the suppression or distortion of the plainest facts.

In that eager craving for a fuller knowledge of the life and work of our blessed Lord, of which I spoke at the outset, we may see an indication of what we ought to substitute for what we thus reject as having done or failed to do its work. Men are seeking for a living Christ, one who shall be more than a name or an idol to them, whose life shall be as distinct and real as that of the kings and prophets who prepared the way for Him, or the preachers and reformers who have carried on His work. They turn to one who professes to give them this, not, I believe, on account of the negative criticism which they find there, but in spite of it. The books which take the strongest hold upon the minds of thoughtful men, to which they yield almost as to a spell of fascination, are not those in which objections to the genuineness and truth of the Gospels are most elabo-

rately marshalled, but those which, in varying degrees, lead men to bow down in homage before the majesty of the Divine Life. To seek to turn that homage into adoring love; to lead men on from the truth they have to that which as yet they lack; to act, in dealing with the evils of our time, as He whom we adore acted in dealing with the evils of His time; to believe that the same personal Will, which we trace so distinctly in the Gospels, is governing the Church and educating mankind now; to act in that belief by seeking to bring out the likeness of the life of Christ in ourselves and others, in the Church and in mankind,—this is the work to which the signs of the times are calling us, and it is one to which all gifts, power, energies, which He has given, may well be consecrated.

APPENDIX.

A.

ATTEMPTS AT UNION SINCE THE REFORMATION.

IF history be more than an "old almanack," an inquiry into the causes of success or failure in past attempts of this nature may give some guidance for the present. They present, at any rate, sufficient points of contact with the history of our own Church to make it worth while to notice them. Brief as such an account as this must necessarily be, it may place a few facts in their right relation to each other, and suggest a fuller handling of the subject to one of greater leisure.

1. The theological imperialism which was stamped upon the work of the English Reformation under Henry VIII.,—and of which the *congé d'élire*, the Final Court of Appeal, and the impotence of Convocation, survive as representative examples,—gave to the English Church an insularity of character, which, for good and for evil, has been prominent ever since. There was no attempt to repair the breach with Rome; as little on the part of the king and the bishops generally (whatever might be the secret sympathies of Cranmer and a few others) to make any overtures of union to Lutheran or Reformed Churches. In the reign of his successor, the sense of a common interest with both Lutheran and Reformed showed itself in many ways. The articles were based largely on the Confession of Augsburg. The service-book of Hermann, arch-

bishop of Cologne, was used in the construction of the Prayer-book. Italian reformers, Peter Martyr and Ochino, were welcomed and promoted, the former to the Regius professorship of Divinity at Oxford. Pulleine of Strasburg settled under Somerset's auspices at Glastonbury. The Swiss and Anglican reformers were in constant correspondence with each other. The dominant party in the Church looked to Calvin and Beza as their oracles. The alterations in the Prayer-book of 1552 were made conspicuously under their influence. The course of things seemed at least tending to a union of Reformed Churches, perhaps of Lutheran also. Reunion with Rome would have been looked on as tantamount to reunion with Antichrist.

2. The accession of Mary hindered all further progress in that direction; and Elizabeth, inheriting very largely her father's idiosyncrasies in dogma as in character, contributed at once to strengthen the nationality of the Church, and to make its isolation more complete. So far as Elizabeth dallied with any thoughts of union, it was, as Mr. Froude has shown, with Rome and Spain, rather than with the cause of the Reformation. Her statesmen, happily, checked and ultimately over-ruled her, and the heart of the English nation, at least, sympathized with the Netherlands in their struggle against Philip, with that of the Huguenots against the Guises. The more earnest clergy and laity still retained a feeling of almost idolatrous reverence for the name of Calvin. The Genevan version, with its copious notes, was beyond all question the Bible of the people. The "prophesyings" which Grindal encouraged tended to assimilate the life of the English Church to that of the Reformed Churches of Scotland, France, and Switzerland, and so to a fuller intercommunion with them.

3. The reign of James opened with the prospect of further movements in the same direction. Trained in the school of Knox; finding Whitgift and placing Abbot at Canterbury; with Calvinism ruling with a reign of terror at Cambridge, and even Oxford; and the Lambeth articles regarded as an authoritative interpretation of points which the Thirty-nine had left more or less unsettled, he, and with him many conspicuous divines, watched the Synod of Dort

with eager interest. It came nearer than any congress of the Reformed Churches had done to the standard, if not of an Œcumenical Council, at least of an international conference.[1] Delegates were there, not from Holland and Zeeland and Friesland only, but from Basle, Berne, Zurich, Geneva, from the Palatinate and Hesse-Cassel: the reformed churches of France were only hindered from attending by the king's prohibition. But foremost among all the strangers, singing first after the President and his Assessors, were the four representatives of the English Church whom James had sent,—Carter, bishop of Llandaff, Davenant, and Ward, and Goad. Men filling high positions, and clothed with a *quasi* authority, took their place fraternally in a synod of divines, not one of whom had received episcopal ordination. There appeared good ground for hoping—more than there has ever been since—that the Reformed Churches were at last about to rejoice in the strength of union, and present a firm front to their opponents. Those who read the Canons of the Synod of Dort may give God thanks that the attempt failed utterly. It had been called together in the hottest bitterness of controversy, and its one work was to sharpen the edge of every dogma as to the Divine decrees that most clashed with the conscience and the heart of man. It was the issue of a fierce strife, and it made it yet fiercer. Its decrees should have been subscribed in blood. It remains as a standing memorial of what may be expected from any like gathering of divines, brought together, at a crisis of panic and irritation, to guard against the besetting dangers of the time, *i.e.*, in other words, to crush those whom they consider dangerous.

4. The new school which was rising at Oxford, of which Laud and Mainwaring and Montague and Heylyn were the most conspicuous representatives, set themselves against all attempts at fraternizing in that direction. They wished to feel in union with the Church of their fathers, with the ancient churches of Christendom. Some of them would have been content with the simply

[1] So the States-General boasted, "quale nunquam antehac Ecclesiæ Reformatæ viderunt."—Niemeyer, *Collect. Confess.*, p. 727.

insular position of the Tudor period. But with others there was a craving for unity like that which we have witnessed lately in men of the same school, and it showed itself in nearly the same forms. Those who mourned over their separation from the great representative Church of Western Christendom, even while they looked on it as inevitable, turned wistfully to the thought of a possible restoration of communion with the Churches of the East. Here also there was an exceptional combination of circumstances in favour of reunion. Never before or since has there been a Patriarch of Constantinople presenting so many points of contact with the thought and culture of Western Europe. Trained in Alexandria, Cyril Lucaris had sojourned, with a wide range of theological sympathies, in Venice and Padua, in Switzerland and Germany, in Poland and Lithuania. With an activity which had hardly been known in that see since the days of Photius, he corresponded with Archbishop Abbot and with Laud, with professors at Geneva, with Remonstrants in Holland, with the Republic at Venice, with Gustavus Adolphus and Oxenstiern, with Grotius and Calixtus.[1] No Protestant divine was stronger in his opposition to the usurpations and corruptions of Rome, and the Jesuits plotted against him without ceasing. In dogma he inclined to the teaching of the Reformed Churches; in ritual he gave a large latitude to "things indifferent;" in criticism and love of knowledge he sympathized with the best scholars of Europe. It was not strange that such a man should be regarded with hope and reverence. Here was one whom Abbot and Laud could alike recognize.[2] A young Greek

[1] The chief dates in Cyril's life are:—

	A.D.
Born	1568
Went to Venice	1583
Patriarch of Alexandria	1602
Patriarch of Constantinople	1621
Died	1638

Compare his life by Thom. Smith (1707), and an article by Gass in Herzog's *Real. Encyklopädie, s.v.* "Lukaris."

[2] It is worth while noticing that the great Alexandrian Codex of the

was entered at Oxford and trained in Anglicanism. The foundation of a professorship of Arabic by Laud indicated a desire to carry intercommunion with the East still further. Here also the project failed. It depended too much on the life and character of one man. When he died, the orthodox Eastern Church relapsed into its stiffness and decrepitude.[1]

5. Other minds found the fascination of the nearer system more powerful. There was a systematic effort to minimize the differences which seemed to make the breach irreparable. Montague, quoting the words of Cassander, the one peacemaker among the theologians of the Church of Rome in the sixteenth century, and therefore disavowed and condemned by her, taught that Rome held the "fundamentals of faith," and was defended by Cosin, even as regards the sacraments.[2] The presence in England between A.D. 1616 and 1620 of the eccentric Antonio de Dominis, archbishop of Spalato—publicly accepting the teaching of the Anglican Church, taking part in the consecration of bishops in St. Paul's, and appointed to

Septuagint and the New Testament came to England as a gift from Cyril Lucaris to Charles I. The Epistle of Clement of Rome, which forms part of the same MS., had not been printed, or even known previously. The intercourse between the East and West was not fruitless, though the issue was not what men hoped for.

[1] Cosin's interesting account of his conversation with the Archbishop of Trebizond may be noticed as an example of a lingering desire for fraternity with the East (*Works*, iv. p. 466.)

[2] *Works*, ii. p. 54. It is worth while to note that Cosin's liberality was not onesided. In his mature age (A.D. 1650) he deliberately recognized the validity of the ordinations of the French Reformed and the German Protestant Churches, justified the admission of their ministers to cure of souls in England, and urged his friends to communicate with them.—Letter to Cordel, *Works*, iv. 403. Compare with this the noble words of his last will and testament, 1672:—"In what part of the world soever any Churches are extant, bearing the name of Christ, and professing the true Catholic faith and religion, worshipping and calling upon God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, with one heart and voice, if anywhere I be now hindered actually to be joined with them, either by distance of countries or variance amongst men, or by any other test whatsoever, yet always in my mind and affection I join and unite with them; *which I desire to be chiefly understood of Protestants and the best Reformed* (*bene reformatis*) *Churches.*"—*Works*, v. p. 527.

an English deanery (that of Windsor),—excited hopes, even in men like Cosin and Overall, that there were many foreign ecclesiastics ready, as he was, to fraternize and prepare the way, by a respectful protest against the excesses of Rome, for conciliation and reunion. Christopher Davenport—better known by the name of Franciscus à Sanctâ Clarâ, which he took on becoming a Franciscan friar,—chaplain to Henrietta Maria, and in frequent intercourse with Laud, Montague, and Cosin, published an *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*,[1] suggesting the method of interpretation by which these documents were shown, as in Tract XC., and Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon*, to be at least compatible with the decrees of Trent. Bishop Forbes of Edinburgh, appointed to that see by Laud's influence, taught in the same strain.[2] Men began to hope or fear, according to their position, that the lines of demarcation between the Churches of Rome and England were about to be effaced. Anglicans dreamt of an independent subordination, mutual concessions, fraternal intercommunion. Rome dreamt that she might recover her lost ground. The Puritan party and the English people were strong enough to give both sects of dreamers a rude awakening.

6. It was the fate of Bossuet to prove in another way the difficulty of all such diplomatic negotiations. Twice he entered upon them under conditions more promising than any that had been known before or have presented themselves since, and twice he was the means of frustrating them. In his conference with Claude (1678) his attitude was avowedly that of a controversialist, and he maintained it with dignity and calmness; but in his correspondence with Molanus, and yet more with Leibnitz, he was professedly entering upon the preliminaries of peace; and, if the past has any teaching

[1] Mr. F. G. Lee has rendered good service by his recent reprint of this treatise, and his interesting sketch of the author's life. It is worth while noticing here that he reappeared, after the Restoration, as chaplain to Catherine of Braganza. The part played by him in the Romeward movement among the courtiers of Charles II. and James II. was probably a very influential one.

[2] The *Considerationes Modestæ*, treating of the points of the Romish controversy, were published posthumously.

for the present, we may see in the course which events took then what may be looked for as the issue of like negotiations now. Trained in the school of Calixtus, and therefore aiming at a reconciliation between the Lutheran and Reformed Churches; following avowedly in the steps of Cassander and Antonio de Dominis; looking to the English Church as presenting the true pattern of Reformation; taking *Beati pacifici* as his watchword,—Gerhard Walther Molanus,[1] abbot (Lutheran abbot) of Loccum, was, about the year 1674, the most conspicuous ecclesiastic in the Electorate of Hanover. The spirit of conciliation which he manifested was met, as it seemed, half-way, by a conspicuous Romish theologian, Rojas de Spinola, general of the Franciscan Order, who opened negotiations from Vienna with many of the German Lutheran and reformed princes, with a view to reunion. Nowhere, as might be expected from the influence of Molanus, was the proposal more favourably received than in Hanover. Conferences were held in 1676, and again in 1683, between him and Molanus and Leibnitz, and partly orally, and partly in a written paper, he held out hopes that the Church of Rome would concede communion in both kinds; the marriage of priests; suspend, modify, or explain the decrees of Trent. They agreed in a *Methodus reducendæ unionis* on these proposals as a basis, and the document was received, at least, cautiously by the court of Rome, though no formal ratification was given to the concessions that Spinola had offered. The correspondence went on, however, and in 1691 took a wider range. Molanus laid an elaborate memorial before Bossuet, containing his scheme for a reunion, and dwelling on Spinola's proposals. The answer of the Bishop of Meaux, both to Molanus and Leibnitz, was characteristic. There could be no talk of concessions on special subjects till there had been entire submission to the authority of the Church. The decrees of Trent must be received in their ful-

[1] The works of Molanus are not easily accessible to English readers, but the correspondence with Bossuet is to be found in the collected works of the latter, and a good account of the whole negotiation in an article (Molanus) by Henke, in Herzog's *Encyklopädie*.

ness.[1] Explanations might be given, but could not be demanded as a condition. Molanus, however, true to the motto of his life, was not deterred, was led on to commit himself to more and more concessions, and, finally, had the mortification of seeing an abrupt termination put to the negotiation by Bossuet in 1694.[2] With Leibnitz, however, as a man of greater intellect and higher fame, the French prelate continued to correspond for some years, on many points both of theological and philosophical interest.[3] Seldom, perhaps, has there been a combat in which the champions were intellectually, at least, so well matched; but it did not bring them nearer to union. The project on which Molanus had set his heart dropped into the background, and they wrote one to another as courteous controversialists. The Act of Succession in 1701 made it hazardous for the House of Hanover to compromise itself by schemes which would have probably involved the forfeiture of the Crown of England. But the attitude of Bossuet is the same as in his *Variations* and *Exposition*. He is a champion demanding submission, armed at all points, not a negotiator paring away and "explaining to the uttermost."

7. It is scarcely necessary to do more than refer to the abortive attempts at healing the schisms of the English Church and nation in the Savoy Conference in 1661, and the Commission for revising the Prayer-book in 1689. With the exception of Clarendon, or whoever it was that drew up the Breda declaration, there was no one at the former period on the royalist side really anxious for

[1] See, in particular, his letter to Leibnitz, No. xl.

[2] It is curious to note the parallelism between this and the rebuffs given to one of the ablest and most "thorough" of the early teachers of the Oxford school. "We got introduced," says Mr. R. H. Froude, in 1833, "to Monsignor ——— to find out whether they would take us in on any terms to which we could trust our conscience, and we found to our dismay that not one step could be gained without swallowing the Council of Trent as a whole." As Mr. Froude looked upon that Council as "atrocious," he was not prepared to make its decrees the basis of an *Eirenicon*. But the thirty years that have passed since have witnessed "developements" in this and in other things.—*Remains*, i. p. 306.

[3] An interesting survey of this correspondence will, I believe, appear before long in the *Contemporary Review*, from the pen of the Rev. S. Stead.

union. Most of the clergy and the country gentlemen preferred the vindictive satisfaction of having their turn now, as masters of the situation, and thrusting Bel and the Dragon down the throats of the Puritans. The alarm caused by James II.'s measures tended indeed to bring Churchmen and Dissenters into the union, whatever might be its worth, of a common panic. For a few months the language of Sancroft and his friends was tuned in a very different key from that which had been familiar to them, and they were willing to consider proposals for mutual concession. Others, like Tillotson, Burnet, Compton,[1] were really anxious for a union (1) of the Church of England and the Nonconformists, and (2) of the Church of England thus united with the Protestant Churches of the Continent. The spirit which showed itself soon afterwards in Sacheverell was, however, dominant in the clergy. The Commission broke up without any result. Another golden opportunity was let slip. Convocation was alarmed at the thought that there were traitors in the camp, and the Nonconformists, with a slight relief from Parliament, were left to take their own course and perpetuate their disruption.

8. Aspirations after unity found, however, yet another representative, and one in no less conspicuous a position than that of the Primate of England. Wake, who in his earlier days had appeared as a controversialist against Bossuet, and had vindicated the attempt of the liberal party in the Commission of 1689 as in harmony with the counsels of Sancroft,[2] watched with sympathy and interest the persecution with which the Bishop of Meaux had sought to crush first Fénelon and the Quietists, and then the Jansenists. It seemed to the more liberal members of the Gallican Church, sound in the faith and revering antiquity, that such a man might be open to invitations to fraternize with them, and that thus there

[1] The quotation on p. 321 will show that in this respect they, and not those who sneered at Protestantism and denied the title of Churches to the congregations of the Lutheran and the Reformed, were the true heirs even of the high Anglicanism of Cosin.

[2] See Debate in House of Lords on Sacheverell's Trial.

might be, at least, some revival of Western catholicity. With this purpose Dupin, one of the most enlightened of these theologians, addressed himself, in 1717, to the Archbishop. A long correspondence ensued, creditable to the intelligence and temper of both parties to it, but it too proved abortive.[1] The gulf was not thus to be bridged over. Agreeing with Dupin in looking to primitive antiquity, *i. e.*, to the Church of the fourth century, as a standard, Wake could not see in the Church of Rome that which corresponded to this pattern, and had no authority to speak except as a private individual; and so the controversy ended. The Archbishop's share in it was, indeed, hardly more than that of a courteous and somewhat cool listener. Dupin's death in 1719 put a stop to all such negotiations.

9. We have seen in our own time efforts after unity that reproduce these attempts in all their characteristic lineaments. The British and Foreign Bible Society was an attempt to unite all English Protestants in common action. The Evangelical Alliance aimed at a confederacy based upon a new dogmatic confession, merging many points of difference, giving new sharpness to protests against Rome and unbelief. Individual ecclesiastics have taken every opportunity of exchanging courtesies with the churches of the East.[2] Distinguished members of the Russian and English Churches have held conferences, with a view, however remote, to ultimate fellowship and brotherhood. Interpretations of the Thirty-Nine Articles, based upon Davenport's model, have been published, first to show English Churchmen that they may hold all doctrines authoritatively taught by the Church of Rome, and then,

[1] This, too, has recently been reprinted. It may be found also in the Appendix to Maclaine's edition of Mosheim's *Church History*.

[2] Among these the Rev. J. M. Neale, the Rev. W. Denton, and the Rev. G. Williams may be mentioned as most conspicuous. The latter has published an interesting Treatise by an Eastern prelate (Gregory of Byzantium, Metropolitan of Chios) on the union of the Armenians with the Catholic Orthodox Church. The same pamphlet contains an interesting letter, previously unpublished, from Archbishop Wake to Chrysanthus, Patriarch of Jerusalem, warning him against the pretensions of the Non-jurors.

after their author had abandoned the attempt, have been revived as a basis of union.[1] The leader of a large and influential school has entered into private conferences with Romish ecclesiastics in England and abroad, has persuaded himself that the decrees of Trent and the English Articles need only to be "explained to the uttermost" in order to be consistent with each other. He has done this while the decree adding the Immaculate Conception was still fresh in men's minds—while he himself was bringing before them its most startling and insane developements, just as Molanus and Leibnitz opened their correspondence with Bossuet while France was still reeking with the blood of the Dragonnades. Hints dropped in the course of the book seem to show that he had received encouragement from eminent French or Italian ecclesiastics, as they did from Spinola; and he has been met, after he had been thus entrapped, with a shout of obloquy and repudiation. The representatives of Rome have nothing to concede. The official answer given by Cardinal Patrizi to the address of some 198 English clergymen suggesting negotiations, is, that the first step must be unconditional submission. The language of Archbishop Manning, if sharpened by the inevitable bitterness of a friendship that has been severed by theological controversy, does but reiterate the same relentless assertion. In theology as in politics, the Papacy condemns itself to the simulated strength of a *non possumus*.

10. So far all efforts have proved abortive. The blessing of the peacemakers may have rested on their own heads, but the breach has not been repaired, the wounds have not been healed. Nor are they likely to be as long as men take their stand upon the documents that belong to the time of hottest controversy, and strive to adjust decrees that were meant to be reciprocally exclusive. It remains to try the more excellent way of diminishing, step by step,

[1] Tract XC. and Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon*. Davenport's book, as mentioned above, has been republished by one of the most active members of the A.P.U.C. (Association for Promoting the Union of Christendom). Mr. Foulkes's book on *Christendom's Divisions* may be mentioned as a thoughtful and interesting contribution in the same direction. Were there many Romish theologians like-minded with him and Mr. Oxenham, one might watch the present course of events with somewhat more hope than now seems possible.

the bitterness of past conflicts; healing, so far as in us lies, the schisms in our own Church and nation; refraining from the hardness, suspicion, haste, panic, which issue in new dissensions;[1] looking out for opportunities to show our sympathy with those even who seem to us in error,—Nonconformists, Romanists, Lutherans, Ritualists, Rationalists,—working with them when we can, fighting on the same side, even if under different banners, in the great warfare against the misery and depravity which surround us, and waiting in patience till the formularies that now stand in the way of fuller union shall, so far as they are thus negative and obstructive, become obsolete and crumble into dust. And to this end, as I have said, the fresh clearness with which the human life and character of our Lord have been brought before us seems to point. "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus;"—that is the secret of unity and the condition of its restoration.[2]

B.

ON RECENT LIVES OF JESUS.

1. It is not quite forty years since the first conspicuous work bearing this title was published by H. E. G. Paulus, then and for twenty-seven years previous a theological professor at Heidelberg. It represented the labour of many years of a life of restless activity

[1] The *Anglo-Continental Society* deserves special mention as repudiating all notion of proselytism on the one hand, and all projects of re-union with Rome on the other. Its aims seem to be (1) to diffuse among the Latin Churches of Europe a knowledge of the teaching and worship of the Anglican Communion, and (2) to stimulate and sympathize with, efforts at a national Reformation after the pattern of the English. It may be questioned, I think, whether it does not present too exclusively the Tudor phase of our Church's history, and invite the Continental nations to conform themselves to our likeness, precisely where we have been most insular.

[2] As these sheets are passing through the press, the welcome given by a clique of clergy to M. Jules Ferrette as Bishop of Iona (!) has caused an ephemeral controversy, into which I do not purpose to enter. Even the rule "Guarda e passa" seems, in such a case, to need a limitation to its latter half.

and singular consistency of thought. For many years his system of interpretation had been taught in his lectures. As far back as 1800-2, it had been embodied in a *Commentary on the First Three Gospels*. At last, in 1828, it took the form of a systematic *Life of Jesus*.

It may be that the line of thought which Paulus adopted was influenced by the history of his childhood. His father, a Lutheran *diakonus*, had dreamt dreams, and seen visions. The boy at the age of nine was taken into the circle of those who met to exchange these spiritual experiences, and told his tale of ghosts and demons.[1] The result was a strong reaction. As soon as he passed from his father's house to the University of Tübingen, and came in contact with the philosophy of Kant, he adopted the side of that system which was most opposed to any recognition of the supernatural. Man was a law to himself, and the "categorical imperative," *sc.*, the utterance of that law, itself universal and unvarying, postulated as grounds of belief, without which it was self-contradictory, the freedom of the will, immortality, the personality of God: but more than this was not needed, and could not be attained.[2] The excellence of Christ's teaching was that He proclaimed this. The laws of physical causation, ascertained by experience, could not be violated. Miracles were impossible. The problem which thus presented itself to the mind of Paulus was to reconcile his real or professed reverence for Christianity with the fact that the whole history of its Founder, as narrated in the Gospels, involved a series of miraculous events. He was unwilling to cast aside the name of Christian. He had not learnt the art of taking refuge in the ideas of Christianity, and treating the facts as "things indifferent." Yet the supernatural could find no admission into his system. He took the course of maintaining boldly that it found no place in the

[1] Herzog's *Encyklopädie*, "Life of Paulus," by Schenkel.

[2] It must not be inferred that Kant's system tended necessarily to this form of Rationalism. There was a time when Dr. Pusey, not less earnest and devout than he is now, recognized that "the 'categorical imperative' was, as the law of old, an initiatory instructor which led men to Christ."—*Historical Enquiry*, p. 165.

Gospel history. The facts were facts, seen through a slight mist, somewhat coloured by imagination; but everything recorded in the Gospels had *something* corresponding to it. There was a *substratum* of fact everywhere. What Euhemerus had done for the legends of Greece, Paulus did for the Gospel story. Thus, *e.g.*, the shepherds abiding in the field saw an *ignis fatuus;* the five thousand were led by Christ's example to bring out the food which in their selfishness they had concealed; Lazarus and the widow's son at Nain were in a state of suspended animation; even *the* Resurrection was the consequence of the effect of the myrrh and spices in restoring circulation; and so on, with a persevering consistency which to us is both wearisome and offensive, and which could not fail to issue in the most revolting conclusions. As far as one can judge, the attempt was made, not in the spirit of one who "saps a solemn creed with solemn sneer," but with a calm conviction that he was making a stand against scepticism on the one hand, and against tradition and Church authority on the other, and pointing to the one way in which the claims of Christianity and reason could be reconciled. As it was, the book did some service. It was the *reductio ad absurdum* of a rationalism pure and simple. Received with horror by the orthodox, and with derision[1] by the more advanced critics, it showed that the position which had been looked on as impregnable was simply untenable. Twenty years earlier he might have founded a school. As it was, he had few or no followers, though the method lingers here and there, and shows itself in the interpretation of single miracles by inconclusive reasoners, who shrink from applying it more largely.

2. Chronologically, as regards the order of publication, the *Leben Jesu* of Strauss (A.D. 1831) should take precedence of that by Schleiermacher, which did not appear in print till 1863. In the history of thought, however, the position of Schleiermacher is between that of the older Rationalism and the later "mythical" theory, and both in the works published in his lifetime and by the

[1] Compare the sneer with which Strauss speaks of it in the last edition of his *Leben Jesu*, Introd., p. 4.

lectures which were printed posthumously, contributed to the developement which followed. Of the former, his *Essay on St. Luke* is the best known to English readers. Starting from the position that the evangelist is but a compiler, he analyzes every portion of his Gospel, sees marks of poetical embellishment in the earlier chapters, brings into prominence every discrepancy between his narrative and those of the other Gospels, and, on the whole, disparages his testimony. Like Renan he maintained the genuineness of St. John's Gospel, and looked on it as giving the testimony of an eye-witness, while the others were but compilations of varying degrees of credibility. In Schleiermacher's character and teaching there was much that attracted the admiration and sympathy of many devout thinkers. His profound reverence for the character of Christ, and for the work done for the world by Christianity, made him cling to the language, if not always to the thoughts, of the older creeds. The man Christ Jesus stood out, so he taught, without a parallel in the whole history of the world, as filled with the consciousness of God, filled and so identified with the Godhead. From such a marvellous personality there might be developements of powers which in us are latent or hemmed in. Whatever power will and spiritual energy have over diseases of body or of soul, that might be expected from Him. The supernatural, in such a case, would be one with the natural. He does not explain the miracles of the Gospel one by one, as Paulus did, nor reject them altogether, as did Strauss. On the other hand, he, too, shrinks from the thought of a miracle as a Divine act, though he can admit it when it is the result of new spiritual forces which he can trace, and whose *modus operandi* he can at least conceive. When he comes, accordingly, to the crucial instances of the Gospel, which do not come under that conception—the marvels of the Incarnation and the Resurrection,—his voice falters, and the trumpet gives an uncertain sound. The Christ would still be the incarnation of the Divine Word, though the history told by St. Matthew and St. Luke were but a poetical tradition. The apparent death upon the cross might have been apparent only. Though acknowledging in terms the

truth of the Resurrection, and the Ascension, he drops suggestions that the former may have been the revival of a spark of life not utterly extinguished. It seems to him indifferent whether the death upon the cross were real or apparent only. While rejecting the hypothesis that the life thus restored ended, to the knowledge of the disciples, as other lives do, and maintaining that all traces of the presence of Christ vanish before the day of Pentecost, he yet dwells, with characteristic subtlety, on the seeming discrepancies in the history of the Ascension, and speaks hazily as if it lay in an uncertain boundary-land between fact and fiction, realities and shadows.[1] So it was, that neither devout feeling, nor subtle thought, nor the strong desire to maintain the faith of Christ as the regenerating element in the history of mankind, saved him from oscillating, at last, between the two systems to which his own mind was, in many respects, repugnant. Against such portions of his book we may well protest, but with the protest we may mingle sympathy and respect. He was, at least, seeking to build up, not to destroy, even though he might be daubing the wall with untempered mortar.

3. The Life of Jesus which appeared in 1831, from the pen of Dr. D. F. Strauss, was one of the epoch-making books in the controversy between faith and unbelief. It created an excitement throughout Germany and Switzerland, which even our *Essays and Reviews* and Colenso panics have only feebly reproduced. It was translated into French and English. Edition after edition was called for. Answers, condemnations, defences swarmed on all sides. After many modifications, at the end of thirty-three years the author has reproduced it, "for the use of the German people," and the new work, more popular in form, more caustic and sneering

[1] Strauss, both in his *Leben Jesu* (Introd., p. 5), and yet more in his elaborate *Kritik* of Schleiermacher's work under the same title (*Der Christus des Glaubens und der Jesus der Geschichte*), dissects the inconsistencies and vacillations of his former teacher with remorseless keenness, pressing every admission which throws doubt on the trustworthiness of the Gospel narrative, and entangling him in the meshes of the coarse rationalism from which, as a devout worshipper and, in one sense, supernaturalist, he was seeking to escape.

in its hostility, has been read as widely as the old. His tone now is that of one who claims a victory in a strife in which he was the first to sketch out the true plan of the campaign. He can point to the progress of thought throughout Europe since as a pledge of what the future is to be. Here also, as with Paulus, there was a reaction against the dreams of childhood. The future critic of the Gospel history grew up amid the visions of the Seeress of Prevorst.[1] From this he passed on to the teaching of Schleiermacher, and from him to Hegel; learning from the one the art of dissecting narratives and magnifying discrepancies, of which the *Essay on the Gospel of St. Luke* was an example; and from the other the thought that in the developement of mankind ideas were everything, and facts only of worth as embodiments of them. With a remorseless coldness every intermediate position which men had endeavoured to occupy between the traditional faith of Christendom and a blank negation was attacked and swept away. Starting with the postulate which he held in common with Paulus, the impossibility of any Divine act otherwise than through the fixed order of nature, he shows how untenable, on that hypothesis, are Paulus's attempts to make the Gospels credible. Mustering all old objections and starting new, he seeks to prove that the first three Gospels contradict each other and the fourth. Without entering into the more elaborate theories as to their origin and their relation to the several parties and sects in early Christendom, as Baur did afterwards, he has a general theory which accounts for them. Men's hopes and wishes, their reverence and awe, tend at all times to develope themselves into *myths*. The Jews of the first century were expecting a Messiah; a teacher appeared who seemed to some to meet their expectations. His name at once seemed as the nucleus round which all floating desires and fancies clustered, and crystallized into the form of narratives. Here was the explanation of the acceptance by thousands of what was in itself incredible. Once received, they kept their ground by the influence of authority, or by that of hopes and fears, interest or blind credulity. There was no deliberate

[1] Herzog's *Encyklopädie*, art. "Strauss," by Tholuck.

invention of what was false. The *myths* were not "cunningly devised," but were the spontaneous, unconscious growth of the time in which they first appeared. If men asked what, then, was left to believe in,—what was the idea which had thus developed itself through what had been looked on as the facts of Christianity, the answer was, that God manifested Himself, not in Christ but in humanity at large,—"Humanity is the union of the two natures, the finite and the infinite, the child of the visible mother and the invisible father. This works miracles in so far as spirit masters nature and makes it subservient to its purpose. This is without sin, for the developement of the race is pure, though impurity cleaves to the individual. This is that which dies, and rises again, and ascends to heaven; for by the negation of what is simply natural it ascends to higher spiritual life.[1] By faith in this Christ, man is justified before God, "*sc.*, by living in the idea of humanity the individual becomes a partaker in the sinlessness of the race."[2]

4. The outcry against the book was, as might be expected, enormous. It opened the eyes of those who had dallied with unbelief to see that they were naked, and it stripped off the fig-leaf covering of words and phrases with which they had sought to hide their nakedness. What was offered as the compensation for all this work of destruction, if it were offered in any other spirit than that of the mockery even then, and yet more now, so characteristic of the author, was hardly enough to give warmth and shelter to any human soul.

5. But if it shook the faith of thousands, and drove thousands also into a reaction against all inquiry, it roused others to the work of defence;—some in directly controversial forms; some in giving as they saw it the Life from which Strauss had sought to strip all approach to reality. Of these, Neander's *Life of Jesus* was the most conspicuous. In forming an estimate of the influence of Schleiermacher on the theology of the nineteenth century, it should not be forgotten that it was through his *Discourses on Religion* that

[1] This, it need hardly be said, is a "purple patch" of Hegelianism.

[2] *Leben Jesu*, first edition, *ad fin.*

the young Jew, David Mendel,[1] after passing through Plato as a vestibule, was drawn to profess his faith in Christ, and as a convert was baptized, and took the new name (Neander), that told of the "new man" that was found in him. In his devout, indefatigable life; in his sympathy with all forms of Christian holiness; in his watchword, "*Pectus est quod facit theologum;*" in the conviction which runs through his Church History, that Christendom rests upon the personality of Christ,—we find what explains his power of appropriating (as Julius Hare did among ourselves) all that was best in Schleiermacher's teaching, and rejecting what was simply negative. The effect of a book like Strauss's on his nature was intensely painful. Those who shared his alarm were anxious to meet the danger with the old weapons, and to call in the help of the State to repress the blasphemer. To Neander that seemed a remedy worse, if possible, than the disease; certain, moreover, not to be remedial. With fear and trembling, feeling that controversy was a duty, and yet also that it marred the devotion of spirit in which alone the life of his Lord and Master could be contemplated rightly, he entered on his task. Though not polemic in its form, the fact of the warfare could not be suppressed; but because he aimed primarily at leading men to gaze on the living Christ as He actually was, and to love what they beheld, his work may take its place as among the most effective answers to Strauss's destructive criticism. For him the Incarnation, the miraculous Conception, the miracles, the Resurrection, the Ascension, were facts resting on adequate testimony, explaining what would otherwise be inexplicable. The renewed study of the Gospel record in the full maturity of a life free from passion, prejudice, self-interest, led him to a fuller and more steadfast confession of the faith in which, as a convert from Israel, he had been baptized. If this was one result of Strauss's first attack, we may hope that that in which he and Renan have fought and are now fighting, side by side, will not be altogether without like fruit.

6. I pass over men like Hare, who reproduce more or less the

[1] Herzog's *Encyklopädie*, art. "Neander," by Uhlhorn.

rationalism of Paulus; over others, who, like Ebrard and Lange, belong to a more orthodox school, and avowedly assume the position of apologists, though their works are at least evidence (as are Bishop Ellicott's *Hulsean Lectures*, and the many elaborate commentaries on the Gospels in our country and abroad) that orthodox theologians do not shrink from the field of inquiry thus opened, and pass to one who is conspicuous among all the scholars of Germany for his position of solitary independence, and for the boldness with which he applies his critical method to the documents of Scripture. The course of Ewald's *History of Israel* brought him to the period when Christianity rose out of Judaism, and he deals in his fifth volume with the personal history of the Christ. There is, in his method of dealing with it, something of the same incompleteness and inconsistency which we have found in Schleiermacher. His criticism leads him to reject the narrative of the early chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke, and to maintain, therefore, a natural human birth.[1] While asserting in terms that there is nothing historically more certain than the appearance of the risen Christ, he yet resolves those appearances into purely spiritual facts. The corruptible body disappeared, we need not ask how, and the glorified body was what the disciples saw, not as a phantom or coinage of their own brain, but as a spiritual and mighty power.[2] If, on these points, however, he speaks as with a stammering tongue, the testimony which he bears to the other facts of the Gospel history is distinct enough. He maintains, somewhat on the same grounds as Schleiermacher, the reality of the supernatural power of Christ, of the change of water into wine, of the feeding of the five thousand, of the healing of the sick, of the raising from the dead.[3] He recognizes in all this (with no recourse to explanations like those of Paulus) the true and, in one sense, natural result of the union of the Divine and the human which he acknowledges in the person of Jesus. He sees in Him one in whom the cravings of Israel and mankind were satisfied; infinitely higher in being, claims, character, than any religious teacher that the world has ever known. While speculating

[1] *Gesch. Isr.*, v., p. 169. [2] *Ibid.*, vi. 69, 76. [3] *Ibid.*, v., pp. 225—227.

freely on the sources and arrangement of the tesselated structure of the first three Gospels, he recognizes the fourth as being by the apostle whose name it bears, as not having a solitary trace in it of pseudonymous authorship.[1]

7. It is easy to condemn the tone and temper of Renan's *Vie de Jésus*, to hold up *in terrorem* the passages in which he ascribes to the Sinless One infirmity of purpose and even an active participation in a deliberate fraud;[2] to point to the inconsistency between these and his expressions of devout admiration for our Lord's character; between his denial of any break in the succession of natural phænomena and his invocation of the sister whom he had loved, to reveal to him the secrets of the grave.[3] It is not equally easy to measure what the effect of the line of study on which he has entered has been on his own mind, or what is likely to be the influence of his book on those who read it. It may be that with the seminarist of St. Sulpice as with many others, the early objects of his adoration had vanished and left a blank,—that he had vaguely looked on the whole Gospel history as mythical, and on its documents as the compositions of a later age than that to which they purported to belong, and that it was the new study of them, pursued among the hills of Galilee and by the shore of its inland sea, that first brought to his conviction that there was in it the narrative, however coloured, of a true human life, that the Prophet of Nazareth had moved to and fro over those hills and by that lake, among peasants and fishermen, and worshipped and taught in synagogues. It may be, that to the thousands whose thoughts have either rested in the symbols of the Infancy and the Death which the *cultus* of the Latin Church brings so prominently before them, or who, having rejected these, have accepted nothing in their place, the *Vie de Jésus* has given a sense of human reality to the Gospel history which they never knew before, and led them to study it with a more devout sympathy. If it has robbed many of their hope, or, as is more likely, given many a colourable pretence for an unbelief which lies deeper, it may have roused some

[1] *Gesch. Isr.*, v., p. 127. [2] P. 361. [3] P. iii.

out of acquiescence in ignorance or scorn to questionings which it cannot answer, and which lead onward to a fuller and truer recognition of the Divine as well as the human aspects of our Lord's life.

8. M. de Pressensé's *Jésus Christ, son Temps, sa Vie, et son Œuvre*, stands in somewhat the same relation to Renan's *Vie de Jésus* that Neander's *Leben Jesu* did to Strauss's. Here, too, there had been the preparation of a devout study of the growth and history of Christendom. Here, too, the work, though possessing a completeness of its own, bears traces of the conflict out of which it sprang. It has for us the interest of being the testimony of one who represents the historical school of French Protestantism, and who, as doing so, accepts the four Gospels in their integrity; receives, without the whisper of a doubt, the narrative of the Birth and Infancy, the Resurrection and the Ascension; maintains, on grounds like those of our great English apologists, the antecedent credibility of miracles in general, and the special claims of those of which the Gospels tell us; and sees in the life and death of our Lord much more than an example, however perfect—the manifestation of the Godhead in the Manhood, the redemption of the world, the reconciliation of mankind to God.[1] As a narrative, though at times, perhaps, over-rhetorical in tone, it possesses much of the clearness and vividness that charm us in M. Renan's style, and the volume (though not complete in all parts, and reproducing in some cases, as, *e. g.*, in dealing with the taxing of Quirinus, and the star of the "wise men," explanations which are now hardly tenable) may be named as perhaps the nearest approach that we have to a full, continuous survey of our Lord's life on earth, and of the materials on which He had to work.

9. I must pass over many books which in themselves deserve mention, and speak of the volume which, under the title of *Ecce Homo*, has brought, if not a narrative of the life of Jesus, yet the nature of His purpose and His work prominently before the thoughts of Englishmen. Here it is obvious, at the outset, that the materials for a definite judgment are wanting. The secret of the authorship has been so far kept, that it is not consistent with the

[1] Pp. 640—644.

ethics of criticism to assume the truth of any conjecture, however widely circulated, or draw any inferences from it, and we know nothing in other ways of the writer's purpose. He deliberately postpones the confession of his own faith. He does not touch for an instant on any of the graver questions that have been mooted as to the origin and mutual relations of the Gospels. He does not indicate his belief as to the Nativity, or the Resurrection, or the Ascension. His belief may be compatible with Nicene theology, or with the Racovian Catechism, or with the limited acknowledgment of the supernatural which we find in Schleiermacher and Ewald. But with this reserve, it is open to us to say that the book, within its range, springs from a profound reverence for the character and teaching of our Lord, an equally profound feeling that critics and theologians alike are losing sight of the power and example of the Life in their discussions about dogmatic and historical questions that cluster round it. To this characteristic of the book we may ascribe at once the welcome which it has met with from men of warm and earnest feeling, and the irritation which it seems to have caused in the system-builders at either extreme of thought. With some of these it has been as though they were "cut to the heart," and therefore "gnashed with their teeth," revenging themselves for the pain given by the rebuke, by denouncing, on this side the unbelief, on that the credulity of the writer. It remains for us to see, when he completes his work, whether he has chosen his ground, as Butler did, in order to lead men upward to a higher faith, or has descended from that height to the level of reverence and love for Christ, as for a man and a man's work, or is himself in a transition state, passing, he hardly knows how or whither, from doubt and apathy to the fulness of belief. In the meantime we may welcome from him, and from those even whose faith is less complete than his, the testimony which they bear that no life in the whole history of mankind commands their reverence like *this* Life. We may believe that the truth of that witness will prevail over the passions, or prejudices, or inconsistencies with which it is, in various degrees, blended-

C.

THE APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS IN THEIR RELATION TO THEOLOGY AND ART.

1. The apocryphal literature of the New Testament has been edited with elaborate completeness by the scholars of Germany; by Fabricius in the last century, by Thilo and Tischendorf in our own. In our own country we have had a somewhat bald and hasty edition of the originals by Dr. Giles, and a vulgarized translation by William Hone. It has been reserved for a French writer to render the service characteristic of his countrymen, and to group, analyze, and classify. The *Études sur les Évangiles Apocryphes*, by M. Michel Nicolas, gives a clearer estimate of their extent in character and history than any other treatise.[1] As a rough classification of those of which we have any traces, he groups them under the heads of (1) Judaizing, (2) Anti-Judaizing, (3) Orthodox. The two former represent the various phases of gnostic error, Ebionite or Marcionite, with which the Church had to struggle; the latter appear as the growth of a more simply imaginative curiosity. Of the two former we have only fragments scattered here and there in the writings of the fathers, or of the heretics whom they quote. The books were destroyed or discarded, and so came to be forgotten. But the books of the third class, which had no such stigma resting on them, were at least tolerated. Though never recognized by the great teachers of the Church, they were read widely, and gradually incorporated themselves with the floating popular belief of the Church both of the East and West. In proportion as the true Gospels were withdrawn from men's knowledge, these took their place.

2. The Nestorian controversy, while it was in part the result of

[1] Bishop Ellicott's paper on the Apocryphal Gospels in the *Cambridge Essays* for 1857, though only a sketch, is both thoughtful and scholarlike. Tischendorf's Essay, *De Evangeliorum Apocryphorum Origine et Usu*, 1851, has been for some years out of print, but a new edition is announced as in preparation.

speculations on the mystery of the Incarnation, was in part also caused by the growing reverence for the Virgin, and tended greatly to increase it. To this tendency the tolerated apocryphal literature was not slow to minister. It came with pseudonymous Gospels, bearing the names of James the Bishop of Jerusalem, or Matthew or Thomas, filling up the gaps in the history of the Infancy, which the received records of the Church did not fill. We have, as it were, a Gospel of Mary, supplementing the Gospel of Christ; the story of her birth, her childhood, her betrothals. Her father, Joachim, fasts forty days, and is without sin at the time of her conception; a *Magnificat* is sung at her birth; her cradle is made a sanctuary; she is blest by all the elders of Israel; she remains from the age of three in the sanctuary of the Lord, and is fed by an angel; her espousal to Joseph is determined by a miraculous sign; and so on, till we come to what, while it runs parallel with the narrative of St. Luke, embellishes it with childish or prurient details. And the animus of all this is indicated by the titles prefixed to such books. They give the history of Our Lady, the Most Holy (*τῆς ὑπεραγίας δεσποίνης ἡμῶν*), the Mother of God (*Θεοτόκος*),[1] the Ever-Virgin (*ἀειπάρθενος*). They tell how she learnt, by the message of an angel, that her end was drawing near; how the apostles all gathered round her, drawn from the ends of the earth by special warnings from the Holy Spirit; how her Son descended with His holy angels to receive her soul; how her body was carried to heaven by the angels.

3. It would be idle to pause on these fables were it not that they have leavened and continue to leaven the theology of so large a portion of Christendom. Just tolerated at first, at times even condemned by teachers of the Church (as, *e. g.*, by Gelasius), the condemnation grows feebler, the contents of the books are more and more accepted. Men refer to them as having a quasi-authority. They become the groundwork of hymns, poems, mysteries. Mediæval art reproduces them in a thousand forms. Even the painters of the Renaissance take them as part of the cycle of facts upon

[1] James, in like manner, becomes *ὁ ἀδελφόθεος*.

which their art is to work. First a *cultus*, and then a theology, is based upon them. Whatever is most startling and appalling in the latest developments of Mariolatry is but the harvest of the seed sown long since, of the tares mingled with the wheat, almost from the beginning; and the controversy with Rome threatens more and more to resolve itself into the question, whether the creed of Christendom is to be based upon the life of Jesus or the life of Mary, upon the canonical or the apocryphal Gospels.

4. Next to the legends of the Virgin, the most popular subject-matter of the mythology of Christendom has been found in the Descent into Hell. It was natural that men's imagination should turn to the few mysterious hints which the canonical Scriptures gave,—to Christ's preaching to the "spirits in prison," to the Gospel being proclaimed "to those that were dead," to the victory over death and hell.[1] It might have been expected that the contents of these Gospels would stand in the same relation to the Romish doctrine of Purgatory as those that I have spoken of do to the Romish *cultus* of the Virgin. But it is not so. That doctrine is to be traced to another source,—to the influence of old heathen thoughts of the unseen world modified and Christianized,—to the mingling of the "mysteries" in which the state of the dead was exhibited, as in the sixth book of the "Æneid," with the "mysteries" of the Christian Church. Without that diffused belief,—we may even add, without Virgil, read and studied as he was,—the doctrine of Purgatory would hardly have taken the form which it actually did take. The popularity of the Descent into Hell, as told in these apocryphal books, as represented in "mysteries" (in the mediæval sense of the word) of the "Harrowing of Hell," was that they taught not purgatory, but a vague, undefined universalism. They painted the dismay of Death and Hell as robbed of their victims. Christ comes to set the captives free, and to put an end to their torments. That the work thus begun may go on for ever, He leaves His cross in the very heart of hell as a perpetual monument of victory, a token that it may not dare to keep any one, however sin-laden,

[1] 1 Pet. iii. 19, 20; iv. 6; Rev. xx. 14.

whom He has pardoned.[1] In the midst of the strongest dogmatic assertion of the eternity of punishment by their teachers, the people clung to this belief. They accepted the popular form of the doctrine of Purgatory, because it did not contradict it. They clung, in the words of the most popular of English religious poems in the fourteenth century, itself the work of a monk, to the belief that He who had begun His work in this way would complete it after the same pattern; that He—

> "Would come as a kyng
> Crouned with aungeles,
> And have out of helle
> Alle mennes soules."[2]

Here again, I believe, the history of popular religious thought is significant and suggestive. The belief in a universal restoration, which we identify with the name of Origen and Gregory of Nyssa, was far more extensively diffused than we commonly imagine. It was widely held by the Nestorian Churches in the East. Even when it was condemned as a dogma it transformed itself into a legend. The systematic theology of the Church was compelled, as it were, in spite of itself, to take some steps to meet it half-way, by theories of purgatory, or of a mitigation of the penalties of hell.[3] It

[1] *Evang. Nicod.*, ii. 10.

[2] *Vision of Piers Plowman*, 12,824. The passage is followed by about 100 lines in the same strain:—

> "All that beth myne hole bretheren,
> In blood and in baptism,
> Shul not be dampned to the death
> That is withouten end."

They are to suffer, *i. e.*, in the prison of purgatory, till their sins are washed away, and then,—

> "My rightwisness and right
> Shul rulen al helle,
> And mercy al mankynde
> Before me in heaven;
> For I were an unkynde kyng,
> But I my kynde helpe."

[3] The interesting story of Trajan and Gregory, given at length in the *Golden Legend*, with its profoundly suggestive conclusion, indicates how these thoughts were working in the minds of men. "By thys (*sc.*, the intercession of Gregory), as somme saye, the payne perpetuell due to Tragan as a mescreaunte (unbeliever)

was a natural reaction against the pitiless hardness of Tertullian, and later theologians of a like spirit. But when traced to its source, it is found to originate not in the recorded words of Christ and His apostles, but partly in those of the apocryphal Gospels; partly also in the inextinguishable cravings of man's heart for a solution of the mystery of evil.

D.

THE RELATION OF THE TWO EPISTLES OF ST. PETER TO THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK.

1. Any fair statement of the evidence on the strength of which the two Epistles that bear the name of St. Peter are admitted into the Canon of Scripture must acknowledge that they stand on a very different footing. Externally, the genuineness of the second is questioned almost as soon as it is mentioned. The doubts are repeated from time to time. At last, with no record of any process of investigation, it takes its place side by side with the first. Internally, too, there is a perceptible difference of style and of subject-matter. The first deals with a time of persecution, and with "hope" —the hope of the coming of the Lord—as the watchword that is to support men under it. The second contemplates the heresy of false teachers as the great danger of the time, and true "knowledge" (ἐπίγνωσις) as the remedy against it. The strange parallelism between chap. ii. of the second and the Epistle of St. Jude indicates a connection of some kind,—derivation of one from the other, or of both from a common source; while the first, so far

was some dele taken awaye, but for all that was he not quyte fro the pryson of helle; *for the sowle may well be in helle, and fele ther no payne by the mercy of God.*"

as it presents any points of contact with other portions of the New Testament, has most affinity with the Epistles of St. Paul.

2. On the other side, there are resemblances in detail between the two Epistles, as between the second and the language ascribed to St. Peter in the Acts, which the hypothesis of deliberate imitation is inadequate to explain. Had it been intentional, it would have been more thorough, and carried out with greater consistency. Some of these parallelisms or coincidences may be submitted to the consideration of those who have learnt to speak of the "First *or genuine* Epistle of St. Peter."[1]

(1.) The exceptional form of salutation, "Grace and peace *be multiplied*," in both Epistles, and in them only.

(2.) The combination ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου in 1 Pet. i. 19; of σπῖλοι καὶ μῶμοι in 2 Pet. ii. 13.

(3.) The use of the rare word ἐποπτεύσαντες in 1 Pet. ii. 12, and of ἐπόπται in 2 Pet. i. 16.

(4.) The recurrence of the word "precious" (ἰσότιμος) as applied to faith (2 Pet. i. 1), the trial of faith (1 Pet. i. 7), the blood of Christ (1 Pet. i. 19), the promises of the Gospel (2 Pet. i. 4).

(5.) So again we have—

φιλαδελφία in 1 Pet. i. 22, and 2 Pet. i. 7;
χορηγεῖν (1 Pet. iv. 11; 2 Pet. i. 5, 11);
ἀπόθεσις (1 Pet. iii. 21; 2 Pet. i. 14);
ἀρετή, as used of God (1 Pet. ii. 9; 2 Pet. i. 3).

(6.) Stress laid on submission to civil magistrates in both Epistles (1 Pet. ii. 13; 2 Pet. ii. 10).

(7.) Prominence of the work of prophecy in both, and recognition of prophets as speaking in the Christian Church, and holding a position in it second only to the apostles (1 Pet. i. 10—12; 2 Pet. i. 19—21; iii. 2).[2]

[1] H. B. Wilson, in *Essays and Reviews*, p. 161.

[2] As this rests upon an interpretation not as yet generally received, I may refer to a more systematic exposition of it in *Theology and Life*, pp. 84—114.

(8.) Each Epistle quotes a whole verse from the Book of Proverbs (1 Pet. iv. 18; 2 Pet. ii. 22).

(9.) Each refers emphatically to the history of the deluge (1 Pet. iii. 21; 2 Pet. ii. 5; iii. 6).

(10.) The use of ἡ ὁδὸς in 2 Pet. ii. 2 in the half-technical sense that was characteristic of the apostolic age (Acts xix. 9, 23), but was not so in the age that followed.

The difference is, in fact, analogous in kind and extent to that between the Pastoral Epistles and the other writings of St. Paul, and it admits of the same explanation. In them, too, persecution, though implied (1 Tim. vi. 12; 2 Tim. i. 8; ii. 3), is subordinate to the peril of false teachers and impurity of life. In both there is the dread of licence under the cloak of liberty, in both the same appeal to written records (New Testament writings as well as Old)[1] and apostolic tradition as a safeguard against the wild dreams and "old wives' fables" that were perverting men's minds. In both we may trace the influence of *spoken* prophecies, determining the form of their alarm, and colouring their language.[2]

3. Assuming, then, that the difference in style is not enough to prove difference of authorship, I point to a coincidence of some interest which is manifestly undesigned, and tends to prove identity. The first Epistle mentions, quite incidentally, the name of Silvanus (v. 12). The second refers to the Epistles of St. Paul (iii. 16), especially to those which treat of the "coming" of the Lord. There is no trace of any wish to indicate a connexion between the two. And yet that connexion is clear. Silvanus had been St. Paul's companion at the time when his teaching as to the Second Advent was fullest; had joined with him, probably acted as his amanuensis, in writing the two Epistles to the Thessalonians in which that teaching is prominent. What more probable than that he should have kept copies of the letters and brought them to St. Peter? What more likely than that the dark words as to the "man of sin" and "he

[1] 1 Tim. iv. 6, 7; 2 Tim. iii. 16; 2 Pet. i. 20.
[2] 1 Tim. iv. 1; 2 Pet. ii. 2, 3.

that letteth" should seem to the Apostle of the Circumcision "hard to be understood"?[1]

4. Another coincidence now meets us, bearing more directly upon the Gospel of St. Mark. The first Epistle names him much in the same way that it names Silvanus. The second speaks of the apostle's intention to do something to enable his disciples to retain in their memory after his decease what he had taught them, as contrasted with the "cunningly devised fables" that were leading them astray.[2] It would be at least natural that he who was as his true "son" in the faith should consider it to be his special work to fulfil the intentions of his spiritual father.

5. With this probability, we turn to the contents of the two Epistles, and compare them with the Gospel. The evangelist records naturally the portions of our Lord's teaching on which the thoughts of the apostle had dwelt most constantly.

1. "There shall arise false Christs and false prophets" (Mark xiii. 22).	1. "There shall be false teachers among you" (2 Pet. ii. 1).
2. "But take ye heed: behold, I have foretold you all things" (Mark xiii. 23).	2. "Seeing ye know these things before, beware" (2 Pet. iii. 17).
3. "The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner" (Mark xii. 10).	3. Same quotation *verbatim* in 1 Pet. ii. 7.
4. "Whosoever will be great among you shall be your minister" (Mark x. 43).	4. "All of you be subject one to another" (1 Pet. v. 5).
5. "My words shall not pass away" (Mark xiii. 31).	5. "The word of the Lord abideth for ever" (1 Pet. i. 25).
6. "For the elect's sake, whom He chose" (Mark xiii. 20).	6. "Ye are a chosen generation" (1 Pet. ii. 9).
7. "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's" (Mark xii. 17).	7. "Honour the king," *sc.*, the emperor (1 Pet. ii. 17).
8. "Jesus still answered nothing; so that Pilate marvelled" (Mark xv. 5).	8. "Who, when He was reviled, reviled not again" (1 Pet. ii. 23).

[1] 2 Pet. iii. 16.

[2] 2 Pet. i. 15. It is remarkable that the selfsame word is used by Irenæus (iv. 1) when he describes Mark as writing his Gospel after the departure (ἔξοδον) of St. Peter and St. Paul.

9. "He delivered Jesus, having scourged Him, to be crucified" (Mark xv. 15).	9. "By whose stripes ye were healed" (1 Pet. ii. 24).
10. "Jesus had compassion on them, because they were as sheep that had no shepherd" (Mark vi. 34).	10. "Ye were as sheep going astray" (1 Pet. ii. 25).
11. "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife" (Mark x. 7).	11. "Giving honour to the wife" (1 Pet. iii. 7).
12. "The Lord was taken up into heaven" (Mark xvi. 19).	12. "Who is on the right hand of God, having gone into heaven" (1 Pet. iii. 22).
13. "Ye shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds with power and great glory" (Mark xiii. 26).	13. "Who shall give account to Him that is ready to be the Judge of quick and dead" (1 Pet. iv. 5).
14. "Take ye heed, watch and pray" (Mark xiii. 33).	14. "The end of all things is at hand: be ye therefore sober, and watch unto prayer" (1 Pet. iv. 7).
15. "They shall deliver you to councils" (Mark xiii. 9). "Every one shall be salted with fire" (ix. 49).	15. "Count it not strange the fiery trial that comes to you, as though some strange thing happened to you" (1 Pet. iv. 12).
16. "Whosoever shall be ashamed of Me and of My words" (Mark viii. 38).	16. "If any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed" (1 Pet. iv. 16).
17. "Take no care beforehand what ye shall say" (Mark xiii. 11).	17. "Casting all your care upon Him" (1 Pet. v. 7).
18. "Lest coming suddenly He find you sleeping" (Mark xiii. 36).	18. "The day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night" (2 Pet. iii. 10).
19. "From the beginning of the creation which God created" (Mark xiii. 19).	19. "All things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation" (2 Pet. iii. 4).

6. Other coincidences, though not with the Gospel of Mark, but throwing light, I believe, upon the relation of the two Epistles of St. Peter to the Gospel history generally, have yet to be noticed.

(1.) The special reference to the prophecy of John xxi. 18 in 2 Pet. i. 14,—"Knowing that the putting off of my tabernacle will be *rapid*,[1] even as our Lord Jesus Christ

[1] The word (ταχινὴ) clearly points not to the nearness but to the quickness of the mode of his death,—his conviction that it will be not by the slow decay of nature, but by the sharp stroke of the executioner.

No. Crucifixion not decapitation.

hath showed me." In the first Epistle (v. 2—4), "Feed the flock of God that is among you"—there is an equally distinct echo of the words that accompanied the prophecy, "Feed my sheep;" and perhaps also in the emphatic "I who am also an elder," to the words "When thou shalt be old." Assume the truth of the narrative in John xxi., and the association of thoughts is natural and intelligible; but it would hardly have occurred to the writer of a pseudonymous letter to insert a reference to the prediction because the commands connected with it had been repeated in the true one.

(2.) It is a special feature of St. Mark's Gospel that he begins with the baptism of John, and ends (if we accept the present conclusion of the Gospel as either itself authentic or representing the original) with the Ascension. When St. Peter specifies the limits of the testimony which the apostles have to bear to their Lord's life (Acts i. 22), it is "beginning from the baptism of John to the day when He was taken up from us." In Acts x. 37—43 we have (St. Peter being still the spokesman) the same limits. Taking these facts in connexion with the inference already drawn, that St. Mark's Gospel embodies the teaching of St. Peter, we have a noticeable agreement.

The conclusion which legitimately follows from these facts is, it is believed, in favour of the hypothesis that the Gospel of St. Mark is rightly assigned to him whose name it bears; that it rests, wholly or in part, at one remove only, upon the testimony of one who had been the constant companion of our Lord, and an eye-witness of His mighty works; and that it represents the kind and extent of information as to the life of Christ which was current among the great mass of believers in the first century.

E.

THE RELATION BETWEEN THE EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES AND THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MATTHEW.

1. St. Peter and St. James are conspicuously the leaders of the Church of the Circumcision. With the former, however, there was, as in the history of Cornelius, a wider catholicity of work. The latter continued to the end of his life to present the purest type of Jewish Christian holiness. In such a case we might expect, in any extant writings of the two men, to find at once some striking resemblances and some striking differences of thought and language. And this we actually do, as we compare the Epistles of St. Peter and St. James.

The following examples will be enough to prove this oneness of teaching. The differences lie more on the surface :—

1. "To the twelve tribes that are scattered abroad (*ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ*)" (Jas. i. 1).	1. "To the strangers scattered (*τῆς διασπορᾶς*)" (1 Pet. i. 1).
2. "Of his own will begat He us with the word of truth. . . . Laying aside all filthiness and excess of malice (*κακία*)" (Jas. i. 18, 21).	2. "Laying aside all malice (*κακία*) . . . as new-born babes" (1 Pet. ii. 1).
3. " . . . shall save a soul from death, and cover a multitude of sins" (Jas. v. 21).	3. "Charity covereth a multitude of sins" (1 Pet. iv. 8).
4. "Humble yourselves before the Lord, and He will exalt you" (Jas. iv. 10).	4. "Humble yourselves under the mighty hand of God, that He may exalt you in due time" (1 Pet. v. 6).
5. "Resist the devil, and he will flee from you" (Jas. iv. 7).	5. "Whom resist, steadfast in the faith" (1 Pet. v. 9).

2. An examination like that which establishes a connexion between the Gospel of St. Mark and the Epistles of St. Peter, will prove a like connexion between the Gospel of St. Matthew and the Epistle of St. James :—

St. James.	St. Matthew.
1. "Count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations" (i. 2).	1. "Blessed are they that are persecuted for righteousness' sake. . . . Rejoice, and be exceedingly glad" (v. 10, 12).
2. " . . . that ye may be perfect and entire . . ." (i. 4).	2. "Be ye perfect, as your Father in heaven is perfect" (v. 48).
3. "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, . . . and it shall be given him" (i. 5).	3. "Ask and it shall be given you" (vii. 7).
4. "Let the brother that is lowly rejoice in that he is exalted" (i. 9).	4. "Blessed are the poor in spirit" (v. 3).
5. "The wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God" (i. 20).	5. "Whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause . . ." (v. 22).
6. "There shall be judgment without mercy to him who showed no mercy" (ii. 13).	6. "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy" (v. 7).
7. "What profit is there if a man say, I have faith, and have not works . . ." (ii. 14).	7. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven" (vii. 21).
8. "The wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable" (iii. 17).	8. "Blessed are the pure in heart, . . . blessed are the peacemakers" (v. 8, 9).
9. "The friendship of the world is enmity with God" (iv. 4).	9. "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon" (vi. 24).
10. "Your garments are moth-eaten, your gold and silver is cankered" (v. 2).	10. "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt" (vi. 19).
11. "Take as an example of suffering affliction . . . the prophets" (v. 10).	11. "So persecuted they the prophets which were before you" (v. 12).
12. "Swear not, neither by heaven. . . ." (v. 12).	12. "I say unto you, Swear not at all" (v. 34).
13. "There is one Lawgiver, able to save and destroy" (iv. 12).	13. "Fear Him that is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (x. 28).
14. "Behold, the judge standeth at the door" (v. 9).	14. "Know that it is nigh, even at the doors" (xxiv. 33).
15. "The royal law, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" (ii. 8.)	15. "The second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" (xxii. 39).

St. James.	St. Matthew.
16. "Blessed is the man that endureth temptation. . . . Blessed is this man in his deed" (i. 12, 25).	16. "Blessed are the poor in spirit. . . . Blessed are those that mourn" (v. 3, 4).[1]
17. "The devils also believe, and tremble" (ii. 19).	17. "They cried out, saying, What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment us before the time?" (viii. 29).

3. These coincidences do not, of course, prove that the Gospel was known to the writer of the Epistle, but they are evidence that the two belong to the same phase of Christian life and thought, that both represent the teaching, true as far as it went, yet not the fulness of the truth, which was taught at the Mother Church of Jerusalem, and diffused throughout the churches of the circumcision.

4. It is a yet further point of agreement, that different as the Gospel of St. Matthew is from that of St. John, and the general tenor of St. John's Epistles from that of St. James, we yet find in each hints and glimpses, as it were, of that fuller teaching which it was left for St. Paul and for the beloved disciple to record in its fulness. In the words of our Lord which we find in St. Matthew, "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. . . . All things are delivered to me from my Father; and no one knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any one the Father but the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him" (xi. 25—27), we find an utterance of the mind of Christ as to His relation to the Father, which comes to us like an echo from the Gospel of St. John, and must be admitted as evidence that that Gospel does not necessarily embody only the thoughts, and contain the language of the writer. So in like manner it is not difficult to discover, even in the Epistle which some have looked on as the most Jewish document in the New

[1] The point here is, of course, not in the substance, but in the recurrence, in both writers, of the same formula of beatitude.

Testament, which even Luther spoke of with an unwise disparagement, that which is in fullest harmony with the highest teaching of St. John. The following table of parallelisms will show how far the agreement goes.

St. James.	First Epistle of St. John.
1. "The Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning" (i. 17).	1. "God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all" (i. 5).
2. "Confess your sins one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed" (v. 16).	2. "If we confess our sins, God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins" (i. 9.)
3. "If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, and one of you say to them, Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled . . . what profit is it?" (ii. 15, 16).	3. "Whoso hath this world's goods, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?" (iii. 17). "If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar" (iv. 20).
4. "Let him ask in faith, nothing doubting" (i. 6).	4. "Whatsoever we ask we receive of Him" (iii. 22).
5. "When he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life" (i. 12.)	5. "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life" (Rev. ii. 10).
6. "Of His own will begat He us with the word of truth" (i. 18).	6. "Every one that believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God" (1 John v. 1).
7. "The friendship of the world is enmity with God" (iv. 4).	7. "If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him" (ii. 15).

F.

THE ASIATIC EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL AND THE WRITINGS OF ST. JOHN.

1. There are, I believe, traces in the Acts that the teaching of St. Paul, full and thorough as it was everywhere, found in the Asiatic Churches hearers better prepared than elsewhere to receive the truth, and that he was therefore able to speak with a yet greater ful-

ness and thoroughness than elsewhere. There, before he began his continuous work as a teacher, had been Aquila and Priscilla ; there also had been Apollos, the Jew of Alexandria, "mighty in the Scriptures," bringing with him some at least of the thoughts of his great countryman and contemporary, Philo. There, for two years and three months, the apostle himself taught without hindrance. The letters which he wrote from it,—those to the Corinthians,—may be taken in part, at least, as indicating the character of his teaching. "We," he says, "are speaking wisdom among those that are of full age (*sc.*, τελείοις, of spiritual maturity, as in Heb. v. 14) . . . the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the *hidden* wisdom (1 Cor. ii. 6). To the Corinthians he had not been able to open it in its fulness, for they were carnal (ψυχικοὶ) not spiritual (ii. 14 ; iii. 1). Those of Asia were of a higher stamp, and could receive higher truths, standing in much the same relation to the Church of Corinth as the Berœans did to the Thessalonians. Milk was given to the one, solid food to the other. What the nature of the difference was is seen in the parallel language of Heb. vi. The priestly office of Christ, the typical interpretation of the Temple ritual, formed part of the higher teaching. He ascribes this knowledge to a special apocalypse (1 Cor. ii. 10). In these visions and revelations he has seen the third heaven and the paradise of God (2 Cor. xii. 1—4).

2. So in like manner, in speaking to the Asiatic presbyters, he lays stress on the fulness of his teaching. He had not shrunk from proclaiming the "whole counsel of God" (Acts xx. 27), had kept back "nothing of the things that were profitable" (xx. 20). He had preached at once the Gospel of the grace of God, and the kingdom of God. He had spoken of the Church as "purchased with the blood of Christ ;" it may be, had not shrunk from saying, "with the blood of God"[1] (xx. 28). When we come to the Epistles written to them, reproducing and reminding them of his former teaching, we find that the truths which are prominent are the

[1] I refer, of course, to the well-supported reading of τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ.

unity of mankind in Christ; the abolition of every national or hereditary privilege; the fatherhood of God, as testified by every human fatherhood; the relationship of the husband and the wife, as typifying that between Christ and His bride the Church; the dwelling of the fulness of the Godhead bodily in Christ; the indwelling of Christ in the hearts of men, their sharing in His death and resurrection, their election in Christ as being beyond all conceivable time-limits, "before the world was." These form part of the "hidden mystery" which he had reserved for the "perfect" and the "spiritual," that which was revealed to the apostles and prophets by the Spirit. The Pastoral Epistles carry on the same line of thought. The *mystery* of godliness is that One more than human was manifested in the flesh. He was the one Mediator, giving Himself a ransom for all men, that He might work out the will of His Father, who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth.

3. We have to think of the son of Zebedee as coming into contact with this teaching, breathing an atmosphere of thought saturated with these ideas, and with the language which embodied them. He finds with these the denials, counterfeits, and distortions of the truth, against which the Asiatic Epistles of St. Paul had uttered their protest. He recognizes now the working of that Gospel which many years before had been communicated to him "privately,"[1] the substance of which had till then been almost as little known to the Churches of Judæa as was the person of its preacher. It falls in with all his personal recollections of the higher teaching of his Master. The way is now open for making known what hitherto had been reserved. He finds the soil ready for the good seed.

4. And here, too, we can trace stages like those which we note in the history of St. Paul's mind. Whatever view we may take of the difficulties of the teaching of the two Epistles to the Thessalonians as to the coming of the Lord, it is obvious that in its subject-matter and general bearing, it answers to the Apocalypse of St. John. Here, too, there are visions and revelations of the Lord.

[1] Gal. ii. 2.

St. John, too, is caught up as into the third heaven and the paradise of God. His Antichrist is as the "lawless one" of St. Paul. The liturgical and sacerdotal symbolism of the seer in Patmos embodies the whole teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Christ is manifested at once as the great High Priest, and the King of kings, and the Lamb that had been slain. And the more closely we compare the teaching of the two Apostles the more clearly will it be found that instead of the broad line of demarcation which some have drawn between the theology of St. Paul and of St. John, there is a striking and interesting parallelism. There is not a single "mystery"—not one, *i. e.*, of the higher truths on which the Apostle of the Gentiles dwells in these Asiatic Epistles—for which we cannot find a parallel in the Epistles and Gospel of the son of Zebedee. It seems to have been part of the marvellous power of St. Paul's mind that he drew to himself, and within the circle of the truths specially entrusted to him, those whose minds moved more slowly or were less bold in utterance. The impression which his Epistles made on St. Peter is traceable in the numerous echoes which we recognize in that Apostle's writings after he had read them. And in like manner, we may recognize his influence here. It will be convenient, as before, to exhibit a sufficient proof of this resemblance in parallel columns, but it must be done with the reservation that the agreement is far more pervading than that mode of presenting it can adequately convey. In doing this I dwell chiefly on the developement by the later Apostle of the special truths or "mysteries" of the earlier.

The "Mysteries" of St. Paul.	The Teaching of St. John.
1. "Great is the mystery of godliness: He who was manifested in the flesh . . . received up in glory" (1 Tim. iii. 16).	1. "The life was manifested. . . . Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God. . . . The Word became flesh, and dwelt among us" (1 John i. 2; iv. 2, 3; John i. 14).
2. "The 'mystery' kept in silence for ages, . . . now revealed to apostles and prophets by the Spirit, that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs" (Rom. xvi. 25; Ephes. iii. 1—6).	2. "He is a propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world" (1 John ii. 2).

The "Mysteries" of St. Paul.	The Teaching of St. John.
3. The "mystery" of the spiritual body as belonging to the resurrection life (1 Cor. xv. 51).	3. "It doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is" (1 John iii. 2). And as indicating what this is, the narrative of John xx. 19.
4. The "mystery" of the union of Christ and His Church, as typified in the relation of the husband and the wife (Ephes. v. 32).	4. "He that hath the bride is the bridegroom" (John iii. 29). "The holy city . . . descending from God out of heaven, prepared like a bride adorned for her husband" (Rev. xxi. 2).
5. The "mystery" of the ultimate restoration of the true Israel (Rom. xi. 25).	5. The apocalyptic vision of the "sealed" of every tribe of the children of Israel" (Rev. vii. 4).
6. The "mystery" of the future glories of which eye did not see nor ear hear, but which God revealed by His Spirit (1 Cor. ii. 7).	6. The symbolism of Rev. vii., xxi., xxii.
7. The "mystery" of the Divine will to sum up (ανακεφαλαιώσασθαι) all things in Christ (Ephes. i. 10).	7. "All things came into being by Him, and apart from Him came into being no single thing that has come" (John i. 3).
8. The "mystery" of the indwelling of "Christ in you, the hope of glory" (Col. i. 27).	8. "The true Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world" (John i. 9). "We will come unto Him, and make our abode with Him" (John xiv. 23).
9. The "mystery" of the developement of evil prior to its final overthrow (2 Thess. ii. 7).	9. The "mystery" of the woman Babylon and the beast that bore her (Rev. xvii. 7).

5. In addition to this induction from the passages in which St. Paul uses the word which indicates one of the special truths that had been hidden till he proclaimed it, there remains a large number of other parallelisms with what is most distinctive in the language of St. John. The prominence given to the *Logos* as the name of Him who became flesh and dwelt among us (John i. 1), of Him out of whose mouth goeth a sharp sword (Rev. xix. 15), is but the unfolding of the thought in an epistle which, if not Pauline, reflects Pauline teaching, that the *Word* of God is "living, and

mighty, and sharper than any two-edged sword" (Heb. iv. 12). St. John's teaching as to the fulness (πλήρωμα) out of which we all receive, is but the echo of St. Paul's words, that "in Christ dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead bodily," and that we are filled full (πεπληρωμένοι) in Him" (Col. ii. 9, 10). The heavenly Jerusalem, as including all nations of the world, is as prominent in the teaching of the one (Gal. iv. 26), as in the visions of the other. The one speaks of the Church as built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets (Ephes. ii. 20), the other sees in vision the twelve foundations of the holy city, and in them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb (Rev. xxi. 14).

6. Further questions as to the relation which the teaching of each apostle bore to preceding phases of Alexandrian or Asiatic thought, or to the false claims to a "hidden wisdom" by which some were led astray, I must for the present postpone. Enough has been done to show that the difference between his Gospel and those of the other three corresponds, as on the one hand to the personal character of the writer, and to the special characteristics of our Lord's teaching at Jerusalem, so also on the other, to the preparation which had been made for it by the later teaching of St. Paul.[1] Those who see only the human side of the work to which their writings contributed will, it may be, be led by this agreement to see in the fourth Gospel the gathering up of the thoughts and speculations of many thinkers. Those who believe both to have been taught by the same Master, receiving an apocalypse from the selfsame Spirit, will not wonder either at their essential oneness, or at their agreement in many of the symbols and words in which the truths that they taught were clothed.

[1] I use the word advisedly. In 1 Cor. ii. he limits the communication of this knowledge to the "full-grown" in spiritual manhood. In Ephes. vi. 19, and Col. i. 28, he prays for more and more openness and freedom, that he might make it known to every man.

G.

THE HISTORY OF THE INFANCY.

My present limits do not admit of a full examination of all the controversies which have gathered round this portion of the Gospel narrative, but it may be well to sum up briefly the chief points at issue, and to note the stage which they have at present reached. It will be seen, I think, that the more searching inquiry to which they have been subjected has ended in gain, not loss.

1. It was said that St. Luke's statement, that "there went forth a decree from Cæsar Augustus that all the world should be taxed," was absolutely unhistorical; that no Roman historians mentioned such an occurrence; and that it could not have failed to be recorded by them had it been true. It has been proved that Augustus was perpetually collecting statistics from every part of the Empire; that he laid before the Senate in his lifetime, and left for them at his death, a "Breviarium totius Imperii," containing a digest of all that was thus reported; that at least in one instance the measure was carried out, not by a decree of the Senate, but by an edict of the Emperor.

2. It was urged, that the statement that this taxing was first made when Cyrenius (Quirinus) was governor of Syria, was a palpable and gross anachronism, seeing that that officer did not enter on his presidency till A.D. 6, when the census-tax which he levied roused the revolt of Judas of Galilee. It has been proved that Quirinus was in Palestine, entrusted with special power, before the death of Herod the Great, and that there are signs at the same period of great excitement among the class of Pharisees and zealots who were afterwards among the followers of Judas.

3. It was said that the circumstances of the alleged census were not in conformity with Roman practice; that in the common course of things Joseph would have been registered at the place of his usual abode, not at the city where his remote ancestors had lived.

It has been proved, that as the census was in this instance carried into effect in a kingdom nominally independent, the Roman practice would naturally yield to the Jewish, and that the required registration would be in the place to which a man belonged by descent, especially when there was any claim to the inheritance of an ancient patrimony. The minor objection, that it would have been at least needless for Joseph to take his bride with him is met by the answer that the Gospel narrative is at least consistent with itself; and that if the facts of the birth were such as they were said to be, it is hardly conceivable that he should have left her alone and unprotected at such a time.

4. It was said that the massacre of the babes at Bethlehem must have been an atrocity on such a scale that it could not possibly have escaped the notice of Josephus, and the inference from his silence was that he knew of no such incident, and therefore that none such had occurred. It has been shown, that on any reasonable estimate of the population of Bethlehem at this time, the narrative does not involve the death of more than a score of children, and that this might easily escape notice in the long chronicle of Herod's crimes. It may be added, that the character of Josephus as an historian is not such as to exclude the possibility of his suppressing the fact even if he had known it, because it was connected with the rise of the society whose existence he systematically ignores.

5. It was said that St. Matthew's account represents Nazareth as having no connexion with either Joseph or Mary till after the return from Egypt; that it is then mentioned as though they went there for the first time. But against this we have to set the probability that Bethlehem had been really the birthplace and residence of Joseph before the espousals, and that he therefore did settle for the first time at Nazareth. The statement that he was afraid to go into Judæa because of Archelaus implies that it would have been otherwise natural for him to dwell there. There is nothing in St. Luke that contradicts this inference. The statement that they went to Bethlehem, as to their, or at least to "his own city," confirms it.

6. The difference in the choice of facts between St. Matthew and St. Luke, though striking, and, we may add, startling enough, is yet insufficient to show that both (or either) were substituting myths for facts. The existence of two narratives, so different in all circumstances, while the one essential fact is the same in both, is proof either of the existence of two traditions derived from independent sources, or else of one common tradition, including both sets of facts, and, it may be, others that have not come down to us. In the absence of data, we are thrown back upon probable inferences; and it will, I think, hardly be disputed that the facts presented by St. Luke are such as would commend themselves to one who looked at the history as from the mother's point of view, while those given by St. Matthew are such as might be chosen by one, like the brother of the Lord, whose mind was fixed on what Joseph had said or done, on the tokens of kingly power, and the fulfilment of ancient prophecies.

7. Whatever explanation may be given of these differences seems also to explain the seeming discrepancy between the genealogies of the two Gospels. Here, again, it has been conclusively proved that St. Matthew gives that which represents the line of succession, naming at each stage the man who was or who would have been the actual heir of the crown of David; while St. Luke, from Solomon to Zerubbabel, and again from Salathiel to Joseph, gives the order of natural descent from father to son. Assuming, what everything indicates, a consanguinity of some kind between Joseph and Mary, so that she too was of the house and lineage of David, it then follows that Joseph's genealogy may have been to the last name or two hers also—that which would be incorporated naturally with a narrative derived mediately or immediately from her; while the "brother of the Lord," standing in the position (as the later story told by Hegesippus shows)[1] of heir to the house of David, would as naturally preserve the pedigree which exhibited the succession of the holders of that proud position.

8. The question whether the supernatural phænomena which

[1] Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 20.

cluster round the central fact, are, by the very fact of their claiming that character, unworthy of belief, must depend for its answer upon that given to the wider question whether we recognize the possibility of any such phænomena. If we postulate the impossibility of any breaks in the uniformity of natural laws, then the discussion whether alleged particular instances are credible is a work of supererogation. If we admit that such breaks are possible, —if we believe that there are "angels and spirits," that God's creative power is not limited to this earth, and that there may be other intelligent beings besides man, then the question takes another form, and we have to ask whether the narrative which records their appearance is generally credible, whether it supplies, so to speak, a sufficient cause for the exceptional marvels? The angelophanies of the history of the Nativity are exceptions, we must admit, to the common course of things. We should regard them with suspicion in any later history of saint or martyr. But if that Nativity were indeed what the history declares it to be, if it were the starting-point of a new period in the history of mankind, and the condition of a Divine Work, was there not a supreme fitness in the signs and wonders that accompanied it? Would it not have been a marvel and a mystery if there had been no drawing aside of the veil, no token that for once angels and men were children of the same Father, and sharing the same joy? Those who halt between two opinions should, at any rate, remember that the angelophanies connected with the Resurrection are just as prominent and as wonderful as those that gather round the Nativity. If the Gospel records, and the life of the Apostles, and the facts of Christendom lead us to accept the one,—if the Resurrection and the facts inseparably interwoven with it come to our minds as things which we cannot gainsay, it is, at least, a legitimate conclusion that what was true of the end of the life may have been true also of the beginning.

9. The same answer applies to objections brought against the central truth of the Incarnation itself. Those who see in Jesus of Nazareth only a man like other men—sharing not their weakness

only, but their sins, dying as they die,—are, of course, consistent in rejecting the beginning as they reject the end. But those who admit, as many do, that the end was not the common end of all men, that Christ did indeed rise from the dead into new conditions of exalted life,—those who see in Him a human character solitary in its beauty and its greatness, the one supreme Revealer of the Divine Will, spotless in His holiness,—these may well ask themselves whether the beginning and developement of such a life according to the common laws of man's being, would not have been a greater and more wonderful break in the uniform succession of phænomena than that of which the Gospels tell us, and which all Christendom has believed. If we could conceive of the commencement of the life of Christ what Romish theology has imagined as the commencement of the life of Mary, would not that have been as essentially supernatural, as little reducible to law, as that for which it would have been substituted? Thus much, at least, may be noted in addition to the authority with which the Gospels speak when, tested and tried in other things—in the miracles of the life of Christ, in the one great miracle of the Resurrection—they assert also that the Son of Man was "born of the Virgin Mary." (1.) There is no evidence whatever that the expectation of such a birth entered in the slightest degree into Jewish thoughts about the Christ. No rabbi, brooding over Messianic prophecies, had fixed his gaze on the great prediction of Isaiah vii. 14. The traditional interpretation of that prediction was the same as that which Jewish commentators have given since, which the school of merely historical interpretation adopts now. There was nothing in the circumstances of the time to lead St. Matthew to devise the history in order to meet the demand of the people for a fulfilment of Isaiah's words. It would be truer (though not the truth) to say that, here as elsewhere, he puts, in some degree, a strain upon the prophet's words in order to bring them into harmony with facts which he had learnt in entire independence of their teaching. (2.) If the hypothesis of a desire to show that the prediction of Isaiah had

been fulfilled is an inadequate explanation of St. Matthew's narrative, it is yet farther from being a solution of the problem presented by St. Luke's. For there the fact is stated with more fulness—an objector would perhaps say, with more embellishment—than before; and yet there is no reference from first to last to Isaiah's words. They were clearly not present to the mind of the narrator. They could not have suggested to him the facts which he narrates. (3.) It may perhaps be said or thought that the belief that the Christ was indeed "born of the Virgin Mary" rose out of the feeling which we have learnt to call Gnostic or Manichæan, that marriage and the incidents of marriage were as things common and unclean, and celibacy in man or woman a higher and diviner state. Out of this reverence for the virgin life, as such, grew, men may imagine, the belief, tender and beautiful as a thought, which embodied itself in the belief of Christendom. At first, we may admit, this theory presents an aspect of probability. It has served to convince some whose general feeling towards the Gospel history was one of reverence and admiration. But here too the mythical theory inverts the order in which facts have succeeded one another. The shrinking from marriage was no element of Jewish feeling. Wedlock and motherhood were the glories of an Israelite woman's life, and without them it was robbed of its chief joy. Scribes, priests, and people were in this respect alike. Even the ascetic Essenes, for the most part, permitted marriage and rejoiced in children. We may assert without any hesitation, that there was nothing in popular Jewish feeling demanding such a history as St. Luke's, that, for the most part, Jews would have found it a stumbling-block and a difficulty. Still less was that feeling likely to exist in the great heathen world upon which Christianity had to operate, and to which St. Luke's Gospel was primarily addressed. It will hardly be contended by any one conversant with Greek, or Roman, or Eastern thought, at the time when the Gospels were written, that there was any demand there for a Virgin-born Messiah. If such a craving showed itself among those who "forbade marriage," and cheated men's souls with

the show of a false asceticism, the Gospel of St. Paul's companion is the last place in which we should expect to find the influence of a belief which the Apostle himself so unhesitatingly condemned. (4.) The true history of such feelings is indeed the reverse of the supposed one. The Christian reverence for the virgin-life, in its several stages, healthy or morbid, as a developement or corruption, has been the aftergrowth of the evangelist's record. It has sprung from the contemplation of her life who was pronounced blessed among women, from the words and the example of Christ, and of the apostles of Christ. It has fed on that record and found its nurture there, but there is not a shadow of evidence or even probability that the record sprang out of it.

10. The question meets us already with regard to many thinkers whom we are reluctant to condemn, and will probably be forced upon us by the progress of thought in many directions, How are we to judge of those who, while they receive the substance of the rest of the Gospel history, admit the Divine work and supernatural power of Jesus, and hold, more or less clearly, the central truth of the Nicene Creed, are yet unable to overcome the difficulties, critical and historical, which the history of the Nativity presents to them? The answer is, I believe, to be found for the most part in silence and in not judging. Maintaining, as we must maintain, that such men's thoughts do not come within the limits of any creed which Christendom has ever held, that they cannot rightly occupy a position as teachers in any church which has inherited those creeds, it is yet right to remember that so far as the difficulties are critical and historical only, not the growth of a scoffing or impure spirit, they may leave men at least with the belief which thousands had in the first ages of the Church, when they heard the words of Christ or His apostles. There may be a confession that Jesus is "the Christ," "the Son of the living God," a loving devotion to His will, a true obedience to His commands, even in the absence of power to receive the history which records how it was that the Son of God "took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance." Of those who make that confes-

sion truly, we may well think as being "not far from the kingdom of God," and believe that if they seek to do His will they shall "know of the doctrine whether it be of God."

H.

THE INFLUENCE OF APOLLINARIANISM ON MODERN THEOLOGY.

1. The Presbyter of Laodicea who gave his name to this heresy, commenced his theological career as a zealous supporter of the Nicene confession, and a friend of Athanasius. Like many controversialists at all times,—like nine out of ten at that time, who brooded over all the problems which the Incarnation presented to their minds,—he passed in his very zeal for truth into an error hardly less dangerous than that against which he fought, and fatal to the life and completeness of the doctrine of the Church. The question, How could the Divine and human natures be united in the same personality? perplexed him as it has perplexed others. How could the perfection of the Divine attributes co-exist with the conditions of human life? the infinite in knowledge and in power with the finite? the perfection which is susceptible of neither increase nor diminution with the nature the law of which, in its best form, appears to be that of progress from the lower to the higher? It seemed to him, in one of those moments that tempt men with the thought that they have found the solution of a mystery while others are groping in the dark, that he had discovered the formula which satisfied the conditions of the problem. The Divine Word, the Eternal Son, had, indeed, become flesh and dwelt among us. The fulness of the Godhead dwelt in Christ bodily. And with the body there was that without which it would have been a carcase—the life (ψυχή) by which men live, and grow, and feel. But here, it seemed to him, the assumption of man's nature stopped. *Instead of* the higher soul—the intellect (νοῦς), growing with the body's growth and strengthening with its strength,—there dwelt in that human body the Divine Word. The will of that Word was the

One will which energized in the man Christ Jesus. The words which He spake were the words, not of a human, but of the Divine Mind. Man's body, but not man's soul, was the instrument through which the Divine Nature was made manifest. Progress, emotion, partial knowledge were incompatible with the unchangeableness of the Divine Nature. In this way, it seemed to him, he was carrying the truth for which Athanasius had contended, to its legitimate conclusion, and resting the faith as on a rock. Words and facts which seemed to tend to an opposite conclusion, must be explained away as an adaptation to human infirmity, a half-dramatic personation of the whole of that humanity which, in fact, had been but partially assumed.

2. Happily for the future of the Church, Athanasius, whose zeal for the truth, though often controversial in its form, was much more than that of a controversialist, thought otherwise. To him this subtle solution of an ænigma seemed to deprive the Incarnation of all its life and power. His belief was in One who was man in very deed, taking man's whole nature—not like the thoughts of the heathen, who dreamt of the gods as coming down in the likeness of men, and in the likeness only. With the characteristic subtlety of Alexandrian thought, he argued that as man's nature was redeemed by the fact of the Incarnation, the redemption could extend only to that part of the nature which had been taken into fellowship with the Godhead. The doctrine of Apollinaris, therefore, on these premisses, limited the redemptive act to the body and its animal life. It left the soul, the intellect, and the will unredeemed. But more than this, the new dogma, in its anxiety to exclude from the Incarnate Word the limitation in knowledge and in power which attaches to man's nature, even in its unfallen state, excluded yet more entirely all that had led men to trust in the sympathy of Christ. He was not, on this theory, one "in all things like unto us," was not "touched with a feeling of our infirmities," not tempted as we are tempted. If the thought of the Godhead manifesting itself through a human body gave, as it was meant to do, a more awful significance to every word and act of the Lord Jesus, yet this exclusion

of the human soul deprived it of *the* significance which the hearts of men had found most precious, and which had drawn them to the Son of Man.[1]

3. All this Athanasius perceived; and in spite of former friendship, and the support which Apollinaris had given to the Nicene faith, he entered his protest against it.[2] The *Logos* had not been a substitute for the "reasonable soul," but had informed and illumined it. The Son of God had taken man's nature, not partially but in its completeness. The zeal of Athanasius for the Homoöusian formula did not prevent his detecting the perils of this ultra-orthodoxy. Gently, as was right in dealing with one who erred through excess of reverence, but decisively, the error was condemned by name in the Council of Constantinople.[3] But it was condemned in name only. There was no definition of what the heresy was, nor formal statement of the truth which it contradicted. And the result was, that as the entanglements of speculation increased, men's minds were again led, in their fear of the teaching which distinguished, in order to divide, the Godhead from the manhood of the Incarnate Word, to the old error. The language of Cyril of Alexandria, in his warfare against Nestorianism, came to the very verge of the heresy of Apollinaris. In the long series of subtle and bewildering theories which grew out of the reaction against Nestorius, the influence of Apollinarianism, though not recognized, is distinctly traceable. His dogma lived again in that of Eutyches. The persistent struggles of the Monophysites and Monothelites to avoid recognizing in the person of Christ a nature subject to the limitations incident to humanity, a will, as man, distinct from that of the Eternal counsels, were but renewals of the effort to simplify the mystery of the Incarnation and give it a logical completeness. With a felicity which the severity of its damnatory clauses has hindered men from recognizing, the Creed which the Western Church based upon the

[1] Comp. Dorner's *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, ii. 395—397 (*Eng. tr.*)

[2] Comp. especially the Treatises *De humanâ naturâ susceptâ*, *De incarnatione*, and *De salutari adventu*.

[3] Can. I. and VII.

teaching of Athanasius, asserted the truth which the East was losing sight of. The Christ was "perfect man" as well as "perfect God," of "a reasonable soul" (anima rationalis) as well as human flesh. He was "One, not," as Apollinaris's teaching seemed to imply, "by conversion of the Godhead into flesh," after the heathen idea of an incarnation, "but by taking of the manhood"—the manhood, as such, in its completeness—"into God." So the union was accomplished, leaving each nature working according to its own laws, and subject to its own conditions. "As the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ."

4. The influence of the dogma thus distinctly repudiated was, however, still felt. Theologians were unwilling to admit the consequences of what they acknowledged in words, and gave to the Creeds of the Church and the language of Scripture a non-natural interpretation, in order to bring them into conformity with a theory which was really, though not avowedly, that of Apollinaris. Athanasius had allowed that the words in which our Lord declared that "not even the Son" knew of "the day or the hour" of His second coming, involved an actual limitation of the knowledge possessed by His human nature.[1] Not so those who followed him. One dogmatist contended that the growth in wisdom meant only a gradual manifestation of what in reality was not susceptible of degrees or increase at all. Others, dealing with the words of the Lord himself, twisted and turned them with a strangely perverted ingenuity. When He said that He knew not, He meant that He knew not *quâ* man, but that His human soul derived that knowledge from the Divine Word with which it was associated; or He used the words (Theophylact[2] does not shrink from the comparison) as parents say to a child who cries for something that it would be perilous to give him, that "they have not got it," at the very moment when they are hiding it from him. There was a simulation of ignorance[3] on His

[1] *Epist. ad Serap.*, i. p. 172. *Orat. cont. Arian.* IV., i. 494.

[2] Theoph. *in Matt.* xxiv.

[3] The phrase is Basil's, "*διὰ τῆς οπρσποιητικῆς ἀγνοίας οἰκονομεῖ.*" (Epist. cxli.).

part in order to induce the disciples to acquiesce in the reality of ignorance on theirs. He who was the Truth took this mode of teaching His followers how truth was to be disguised and dealt out with a wise "economy." It will hardly be disputed that the old leaven still works. Commentators, and schoolmen, and divines still give the same elaborate evasions. While their devotion or their rhetoric leads them to dwell on the reality of our Lord's human emotions as moving men to trust in His perfect sympathy with joy, sorrow, friendship, patriotism, even with righteous anger, and fear of death, and shrinking from the cup of suffering, they shut out of sight the fact that He has known, so to speak, the temptations of the human intellect, the trials incident to its limitations, and has lived in this respect also a pattern life, passing through stages of knowledge as we pass—educated, as we are educated, by the Divine Word, and the discipline of life, receiving knowledge—the "hidden treasures of wisdom"—as we receive it, from the Father.

5. As was to be expected, those who saw an *οἰκονομία* and *προσποίησις* in Mark xiii. 32, were for the most part unable to recognize any real "increase in wisdom" in Luke ii. 52. Even for Athanasius it was only a manifestation to lookers-on (*ἡ φανέρωσις τῆς θεότητος τοῖς ὁρῶσιν*).[1] Here the language of Gregory of Nyssa[2] was at once bolder and truer. "Scripture," he says, "with no false reverence (*ἀνεπαισχύντως*) ascribes to Christ all the attributes by which our nature is characterized, save only the bias which leads us to sin." So, in like manner, Leontius, in the seventh century, takes both the passages in question in their obvious and natural meaning,—"The majority of the fathers, nearly all of them, say that He knew not: for if He is said to be of one substance with us in all things, and we are ignorant of some things, then manifestly He too was ignorant."[3] "The Scripture saith of Him that He increased in wisdom, manifestly, *i.e.*, by learning that which previously He knew not."[4]

6. The tendency of the philosophical teaching of the great scho-

[1] *Orat. IV. cont. Arian.* [2] *Ad Eustach.* [3] *De Sectis*, p. 546.
[4] *Ibid., ad fin.*

lastic theologians was, however, towards a modified Apollinarianism, and they have transmitted it to many, both among Romanist and Protestant divines. Peter Lombard follows in the track of those who held that the "increase in wisdom" was "secundum ostensionem et aliorum hominum opinionem."[1] With more elaborate subtlety and never-ending distinctions, Aquinas comes practically to the same conclusions,[2] and they are maintained by representative Romish commentators like Maldonatus. With the Reformation, however, there was a revival of the craving for a true and not a fictitious Incarnation, which had been the groundwork of the faith of Athanasius, but which even his teaching, and still more that of many of his followers, had failed to satisfy.

So, to come nearer to our own time, Calvin urges,[3] that as Christ was like unto us in all things, this, beyond all doubt, includes His "being subject to ignorance;" the one distinction being, that whereas in us ignorance is often the result of sin, that form or degree of ignorance was not to be found in Him. So Taylor, while stating the difficulty, and leaving it as an unsolved question, clearly shows that he inclines to the belief that "it belongs to the verity of human nature to have degrees of understanding as well as of other perfections," and that "the Godhead might as well suspend the emanation of all the treasures of wisdom upon the Humanity for a time, as He did the beatifical vision, which most certainly was not imparted in the interval of His sad and dolorous passion."[4] So Beza taught,[5] that "ipsa Θεότητος plenitudo sese, prout et quatenus ipsi libuit, humanitati assumptæ insinuavit." And Grotius (on Mark xiii. 32) finds the solution of the problem in the thought, "ut dicamus divinam sapientiam menti humanæ Christi effectus suos impressisse *pro temporum ratione.*" Tillotson reproduced the same thought in nearly the same words;—"It is not unreasonable to suppose that the Divine wisdom which dwelt in our Saviour did communicate itself to His human soul, according to its pleasure,

[1] *Sent.*, iii. 13. [2] *Summ. Theol. III.*, Qu. x.—xii., and Qu. xv. art. 3.
[3] Comm. on Luke ii. 40 and Mark xiii. 32. [4] *Life of Christ*, i. 7.
[5] Comm. on Luke ii. 52.

and so His human nature might at some times not know some things." Bengel, in like manner, in his note on the words "increased in wisdom," says in his terse brevity, "idque revera, sed longe supra modum hominis communis."

7. Such has been the history of this attempt to substitute the supposed inferences from a dogmatic truth for the simpler teaching of Scripture. Had the matter rested here, it would have been interesting as an illustration of the intrusive restlessness of the understanding when it enters, even in the spirit of devoutest reverence, upon speculations which transcend it. But the evil did not end here. In proportion as the influence of Apollinarianism pervaded, however indirectly, the theology of the Church, men lost their hold on the truth of the perfect human sympathy of Christ, and they turned more and more to one in whom they hoped to find it. If the reaction against Nestorianism was one cause of the growth of Mariolatry, this was undoubtedly another. There was, as Dr. Newman has said,[1] "a wonder in heaven, — a throne far above all created powers, mediatorial, intercessory," — and the thoughts of men turned to her whom they had before learnt to reverence and love, as being "the predestined heir of that Majesty." The human life, even the teaching of Christ, became comparatively subordinate, and the devotion of men turned rather to the beginning and the end—the Infancy and the Crucifixion. Doubtless, at the worst of times, and under the fullest *cultus* of the Virgin, the other and truer thought was at times awakened into life. Men have sung of the love of Jesus, and found their refuge in the heart of Christ. But in the popular religion of the Latin Church, men and women have turned to the Virgin Mother rather than to the Son, as believing that they would there find a fuller sympathy, and a more benignant reception of their prayers.

8. With others, the reaction against the unreality which the adoption, partial or complete, of Apollinarian thought has led them to feel in popular statements as to the Gospel history, has taken another form. Not having been taught to feel that it was a human

[1] *Essay on Development*, p. 405.

mind and a human heart that spoke to their minds and hearts there, they have turned with an eagerness which we ought to welcome, to those who have restored the humanity of Christ to its life and power, even when in doing this they have sacrificed the truth of His being also the Eternal Word. In proportion as any Life of Jesus has brought this as a living reality before men, they have welcomed and accepted it. In the language of current theology, they could trace no recognition of the growth in wisdom, no pattern life unfolding in affections, intellect, wisdom, as ours unfolds; brought by degrees into fullest fellowship with the Divine Nature, illuminated by the pervading presence of the eternal Light, and growing, as our nature grows, in the power of receiving and transmitting it; and so they have found what met the cravings of their hearts in the clearer, more vivid pictures, of those even who thought of the Christ not as manifesting His Father in heaven, but as being altogether, even in ignorance of truth, and infirmity of purpose, and acquiescence in evil, such an one as themselves. The remedy for that perversion or denial of the truth, the safeguard against that danger, are to be found not in falling back upon the partial suppression of the truth, the history of which has been here traced, but in proclaiming in its fulness the Church's faith that in that union of the Godhead and the manhood, the latter is indeed taken into the former, yet not so as to lose its distinctness. The Christ is "perfect God and perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting."

I.

THE PERSONALITY OF EVIL.

THE question whether we may ascribe to evil a personal source or representative, as we ascribe such a source and representative to good—whether, in popular language, we may believe in the existence of a Devil, as we believe in the Being of God, may be discussed

partly on speculative grounds external to what claims to be a revelation, partly as affected by the teaching of what does assert that claim. In either case it is clearly one of immense importance both theoretically and practically. It must affect our belief as to the history of all the past, as to the will and power of God. It cannot be without its influence on our daily life, on our hopes and fears for the future. The belief may turn out to be so untenable philosophically, so at variance with scientific truth, or leading to such monstrous consequences in practice, that the fact of its being asserted by a system claiming to be a revelation may become the strongest of all arguments against the admission of that system as authoritative. It may come to be looked at as only one guess out of many, one stage in the history of human thought; and those who, holding this, are yet believers in Christianity, on grounds which seem to them sufficient, may be tempted to eliminate, as far as they can, what seems to them an accommodation to popular language, the acceptance of an error now exploded. To such inquirers I venture to submit some thoughts for their consideration.

1. On speculative grounds, it may be said that the assumption of a personal Will working evil is, at least, a natural inference from the facts of human experience. By whatever path men have ascended to the thought of God, from proofs of design to the existence of a designer, from the things that are seen to the great Workmaster; from their thoughts of truth, goodness, might, to the archetype in Whom they meet; from all that gives blessedness and delight, outward joy, inward peace, kindness, truth, purity, to One who is the giver of every perfect gift, the same path leads them (at least in the earlier stages of thought, and before the conclusion is set aside by reasons of greater weight) to believe in the personality of Evil. Side by side with traces of a purpose for good, there seem, at least, traces of a purpose warring against it in the world of nature, and yet more in the lives of men. We recognize in ourselves and others an evil which we hate, and form a conception of an evil greater than any we have known, and reason from that conception to its archetype, from the abstract to the concrete. We

find in us what destroys our joy and peace, and we are led to think of a Destroyer as we were led before to think of a Divine Giver. Dualism, of some kind, is at least a natural conclusion from the facts of the universe. The history of the religions of the world, of the creeds of Zoroaster, Manes, Mahomet, of those which the philosophical inquirer may be led to class with them, the creeds of Jews and Christians, show how widely it has been received, how men have been led to accept it as solving the phænomena of the universe and of their own experience.

2. The belief may take different forms, and stand in different relations to the belief in God. Men may think of evil as coeternal with good, Ahriman and Ormuzd as alike beyond all time limits, of the struggle as lasting through long ages, possibly destined to continue for ever, possibly ending, we know not how or when, in the final victory of good. They may look on the evil as having originated (as we find it originates in ourselves) by an act of rebellion of the creature against the Creator, an enmity against God, developing itself with intense malignity in a created will when as yet the worlds were not, or when man had not yet begun his career on this earth of ours. They may believe that from one such will as its source all the evil that is in the world, visible and invisible, has sprung; that that will has exercised a fatal influence on the destinies of the human race; that every man born into this world must either renounce it or be subject to it. They may think of this sovereignty—for it is little less than that—as permitted by the Divine Will, but within limits of time and space which it is not to pass, and as destined, in some unknown future, to be utterly destroyed. They may think of this victory of good as consisting either in the annihilation of every rebellious will, human or angelic, throughout the universe, or in the restoration of each such will to harmony and blessedness, or in its condemnation to perpetual misery, or in the frustration of the antagonism of the primal rebellious will by the deliverance of at least all the human souls that it has ensnared and held in bondage. All these beliefs, it need scarcely be said, have found their representatives, some among

Christian thinkers, some among those of the other religions of the world.

3. The effects of the belief on the lives and characters of men have been as varied as the forms which the belief has taken. Some, looking to the prevalence of evil as indicating a mastery against which it was vain to struggle, have wrought out for themselves an actual worship of a Power who is to them the representative of every evil and malignant attribute. They have propitiated him by human sacrifices, by acts hateful and monstrous. Others have lived in fear and terror, the slaves of spectral horrors, sometimes fascinated by the thought of participating in the power of this spiritual evil, and so ruling over the wills of others. We must admit that the belief in a Devil has been fruitful in a thousand forms of superstition wherever it has existed apart from faith in God. But where this has been present as a living power, either in systems external to Christianity, or within Christendom itself, in the religion of Zoroaster as in that of the Bible, in what we have learnt to classify as the highest Aryan no less than in Semitic creeds, there, among countless millions and through long ages, it has been the source of strength, heroism, goodness. It has raised men to a consciousness of the warfare which they have to fight, and kept them in the attitude of watchfulness against the temptations of their lower nature, because they have seen in those temptations the agency of a spiritual evil. If we measure beliefs by their results, it would be true to say that the works of the devil have most abounded where men denied or practically forgot that there was a devil; that they have been found in smaller number, and with less intensity of evil, where that belief has been present to men's minds perpetually. The lives of tens of thousands of the best and holiest men, in all divisions of Christendom, testify to the same truth. Whatever ethical nobleness we recognize in the first preachers of Christianity appears, *primâ facie* at least, to have this belief not only as an accompaniment, but as one of its conditions. In the highest pattern-life, by the confession of most unbelievers as well as all Christians, it appears with an intensity which has hardly a parallel elsewhere.

4. The tendency of modern thought towards a Christianized Pantheism which leads to the ultimate obliteration of the boundary-lines between good and evil, makes it necessary to insist on this. Historically, there may be room for doubt and discussion as to the origin of the name Satan, and its appearance in the Books of the Old Testament, and the associations that cluster round it. It may be questioned whether the narrative of the Temptation implies or suggests the identification of the animal serpent with a spiritual power of evil; whether the dramatic form of the Book of Job supplies a sufficient foundation for a dogma; whether the character of Satan as it meets us there is that which we have learnt to connect with the name of the great Adversary; whether the vision of Zechariah, in which he again appears, does more than reproduce the symbolism of the earlier poem; whether the clearer and more developed belief of later Judaism in diabolical agency may not be traced to the influence of the dualism of Zoroaster: but this, at least, is clear, that it entered deeply, fully, ineradicably into the lives and teaching of Christ and His disciples. It cannot be dealt with as a mere separable accident, the local colouring of an eternal truth. It was interwoven inseparably with the truth through its whole tissue. In the great spiritual crisis which preceded the commencement of His work, He was brought (as in the narrative which, if it be not altogether legendary, must have come from Him) into direct personal antagonism with that spiritual evil. When He hears of the new life which was kindling among the people at the voice of His disciples, He beholds, as in vision, "Satan like lightning fall from heaven." His explanation of the growth of the tares among the wheat—of the failure of the good seed to bring forth fruit—is that they are the devil's work. He sees in the shame and confusion of His betrayal and crucifixion the temporary triumph of the "prince of this world," of the "powers of darkness." Satan has "desired to have" the disciples, "that he may sift them as wheat." He sends them forth, after His resurrection, to carry on their warfare against "all the power of the enemy." And the same thought underlies the teaching of the apostles.

Whatever differences may divide Peter from Paul, or both from John, they agree in this as they agree in the acknowledgment of their Lord and Master. Their one thought is that "their adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, goeth about seeking whom he may devour;" that they are to "resist" him; that they wage their warfare not with flesh and blood, but with "principalities and powers;" that the "Son of God was manifested to destroy the works of the devil."

THE END.

J. AND W. RIDER, PRINTERS, LONDON.

By the same Author.

LAZARUS, AND OTHER POEMS.

Small 8vo, 5s.

"Polished and often beautiful verse. . . . A scholar's reading of the religion of the times clothed in the rhythm and music of a poetical mind. . . . The gem of the book is Mr. Plumptre's striking translation of the Song of Deborah."—*Spectator.*

"Mr. Plumptre has tried a very daring experiment, and in our judgment has succeeded."—*Reader.*

"Rich in the results of modern culture: . . . beyond mistake the outpourings of an earnest and affectionate mind."—*Guardian.*

THEOLOGY AND LIFE.

SERMONS ON SPECIAL OCCASIONS.

Small 8vo, 6s.

"Earnest, clear, eloquent, . . . adhering to the old formulæ."—*Spectator.*

"Always earnest, always devout, and never afraid to meet a new thought."—*Church and State Review.*

"Vigorous in thought and unconventional in manner, faithful, earnest, and sound in the faith. . . . At once scholarly, instructive, and practical."—*British Quarterly Review.*

"Subdued evangelicalism and ineffectual mediation."—*Westminster Review.*

"It is long since we have read a volume of sermons which maintains so high a level of thought, feeling, and expression. . . . If the writer attempts to take up a position of mediation and reconciliation between contending extremes, it is in no unworthy spirit of accommodation."—*Theological Review.*

"As a whole, this volume presents in a high degree that combination of wise and conscientious exposition of scriptural truth with the practical enforcement of its lessons, which alone could justify, as indeed it does amply justify, the title selected by the author."—*Nonconformist.*

MASTER AND SCHOLAR,

ETC., ETC.

Small 8vo, 5s.

"*Master and Scholar* is worthy to be put on the same shelf with Heber, and Mr. Plumptre's own favourite, Keble."—*Westminster Review.*

"The present volume, of great outward and visible elegance, and of great inward and intellectual grace, offers abundant evidence of the author's poetical gifts."—*Illustrated London News.*

"The exceedingly able article in the *Contemporary Review* for July, 1866, by the same author, on Friar Bacon, should be read as a commentary and introduction to this poem (*Master and Scholar*). . . . With exquisite delicacy Mr. Plumptre pours forth once more the pitiful wail of poor Eloïse's broken heart over the idol of her passion, . . . and weaves the traditions of the Magdalen into a charming poem."—*British Quarterly Review.*

THE TRAGEDIES OF SOPHOCLES

A NEW TRANSLATION, WITH A BIOGRAPHICAL ESSAY.

New Edition, with an Appendix of Rhymed Choruses.

Small 8vo.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS ON THE FIRST EDITION.

"Let us say at once that Professor Plumptre has not only surpassed the previous translators of Sophocles, but has produced a work of singular merit, not less remarkable for its felicity than its fidelity; a really readable and enjoyable version of the old plays."—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

"Sophocles has certainly never before had an English dress half as simple and graceful, half so free from the disguise of artificial ornament or rhetorical ambition."—*Spectator.*

"Incomparably better than the translations of his three predecessors."—*Fortnightly Review.*

"Prefixed to it is one of the best lives of the poet we have ever read. . . . To scholarship and general accuracy, Mr. Plumptre adds a cultivated ear and an unusually poetical diction."—*Westminster Review.*

"There is much in Professor Plumptre's English *Sophocles* which satisfies a high critical standard. . . . Out of the very difficult task of forcing unrhymed strophes and antistrophes upon an English ear, he has come forth with more success than we could have anticipated."—*Saturday Review.*

ALEXANDER STRAHAN, 56, LUDGATE HILL, LONDON.

BOUND BY VIRTUE & Co CITY ROAD

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01012 4735